arXiv:1204.5078v2 [math.OA] 19 Nov 2012

On Super-KMS Functionals for Graded Quantum Field Nets[*]

ROBIN HILLIER[†]

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”
Via della Ricerca Scientifica, 1, I-00133 Roma, Italy
E-mail: `hillier@mat.uniroma2.it`

March 3, 2013

Abstract

Motivated by a few preceding papers, we introduce super-KMS functionals for graded translation-covariant nets over $\mathbb{R}$ with superderivations, roughly speaking as a certain supersymmetric modification of classical KMS states on translation-covariant nets over $\mathbb{R}$, fundamental objects in chiral algebraic quantum field theory. Although we are able to make several surprising statements concerning their general structure, most properties will be studied in the setting of individual models, and our main interest lies in superconformal models. In particular, we provide a constructive existence and partial uniqueness proof of super-KMS functionals for the supersymmetric free field, for its rational extensions, and for the super-Virasoro net with central charge $c \geq 3/2$. Moreover, we show that super-KMS functionals for graded nets – as one of their main applications – give rise to generalized perturbation-invariant entire cyclic (JLO) cocycles and thus to a connection with noncommutative geometry.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 General aspects of super-KMS functionals **4**

3 Models and super-KMS functionals **9**

4 JLO cocycles and deformations of super-KMS functionals **19**

Appendix **22**

A A generalization of Araki's criterion on quasi-equivalence **22**

B Super-KMS functionals for graded-local conformal nets over S^1 **26**

C Some technical proofs **29**

---

[*] MSC: 81T28, 81T75, 46L55. Keywords: algebraic conformal quantum field theory, entire cyclic cohomology, KMS condition, supersymmetry

[†] Supported by the ERC Advanced Grant 227458 ”Operator Algebras and Conformal Field Theory”.

1 Introduction

In the 1950s, Kubo, Martin and Schwinger studied certain thermodynamical equilibrium states of many-particle quantum systems [MS59], enabling later on several physical applications, e.g. in black hole dynamics or phase transitions. Haag, Hugenholtz and Winnink then used their construction to formulate an abstract algebraic relation which led to the notion of KMS states for arbitrary C*-dynamical systems. The probably most famous C*-dynamical systems with an immediate quantum field theoretical meaning are the C*-algebra of the canonical commutation (or anticommutation) relations on a given Hilbert L^2-space, in short CCR (or CAR, respectively), equipped with translation actions. Roughly speaking, they describe bosonic (fermionic) free fields, and are therefore of fundamental interest in mathematical physics. A detailed discussion of the KMS condition for CCR and CAR algebras together with other specific situations can be found in [BR97]. A more direct and specific study and classification of KMS states for the CCR and CAR algebras over a real infinite-dimensional Hilbert space with respect to a given symmetry group has been achieved in [RST69, RST70]. In this context it was shown that they are quasi-free, a property extensively investigated in [Ara70, AM71, Ara71] for the CCR and CAR algebras.

Given the importance of KMS states to quantum field theoretical systems, it seems natural to study them also in the context of algebraic quantum field theory, the general axiomatic formulation of quantum field theories over arbitrary spacetimes by means of nets of quantum fields, cf. [Haa92] for an overview. The first steps in that direction were taken in [BJ89]. In later years quantum field theories with conformal symmetries on low-dimensional spacetimes became more and more interesting, due to their beautiful mathematical structure related to modular theory and subfactor theory of von Neumann algebras on the one hand, and to their physical meaning on the other hand, cf. e.g. [FG93]. An extensive study of KMS states for chiral conformal nets over the real line $\mathbb{R}$ with respect to translations has been recently performed in [CLTW11a, CLTW11b], dealing in detail with several important models and providing a complete classification of KMS states for completely rational nets.

Another interesting aspect of quantum field theory and in particular also string theory is supersymmetry, an internal symmetry between bosons and fermions, i.e., even and odd elements of the algebra, respectively. Although physical experimental confirmation is lacking so far, its mathematical structure is very rich and extends to the general context of C*-algebras, in which we are going to work here. A famous application of supersymmetry is found in Connes's concept of spectral triples [Con94]. Given such a spectral triple with θ-summability conditions, one constructs in a natural way a “super-Gibbs functional“, which then gives rise to an entire cyclic cocycle, cf. also [JLO88, Con89]; it turns out to be a geometric invariant for certain ”regular perturbations” of the spectral triple. This construction is the starting point for a noncommutative geometric description of graded-local conformal nets as achieved in [CHL12]. The cocycles there give rise to geometric invariants, which, in particular, recover parts of the representation theory of the graded-local conformal net, as partially suggested already in [Lon01, KL05, CKL08, CHKL10].

It seems natural to ask whether this construction of entire cyclic cocycles can be generalized from super-Gibbs functionals to other functionals and whether they still give rise to noncommutative geometric invariants or thermodynamical interpretations. In fact, Jaffe, Lesniewski and Wisniowski [JLW89] and independently Kastler [Kas89] took the first steps into that direction. They showed that bounded super-KMS functionals give rise to entire cyclic cocycles. Unfortunately, at that time several no-go theorems were still unknown, in particular that nontrivial super-KMS functionals for the translation action cannot be bounded [BL00], which turned their constructions out to be inapplicable here.

It took several years to construct at least one first example of algebraic supersymmetry with unbounded but locally bounded super-KMS functionals and associated local-entire cyclic cocycle for the supersymmetric free field [BG07], which, however, still has to be put into the framework of graded nets of von Neumann algebras.

From this introduction, some questions seem to emerge quite naturally:

- Can we provide a suitable definition of super-KMS functionals for graded translation-covariant nets over $\mathbb{R}$ of von Neumann algebras and determine abstract properties, extending the results in [BL00]?
- Can we find examples or even a classification of super-KMS functionals for some explicit (say, chiral superconformal) models?
- Can we formulate a general classification of super-KMS functionals for graded translation-covariant nets, in analogy to [CLTW11a, CLTW11b]?
- Do super-KMS functionals for graded translation-covariant nets give rise to entire cyclic cocycles and geometric invariants of the original net, generalizing [CHL12]?

In the present paper, we shall deal with some of these questions. Regarding the first one, we start in Section 2 with a definition of super-KMS functionals which seems suitable in general and in the context of graded translation-covariant nets over $\mathbb{R}$. This permits us to make a few general statements, e.g. that a KMS functional on a completely rational conformal net has to be unbounded and nonpositive if it does not coincide with the unique KMS state, or that its Jordan decomposition cannot be obtained as an inductive limit.

In general, however, it seems difficult to arrive at abstract statements. As our original motivation lies in graded-local conformal (or even superconformal) nets, we therefore turn in Section 3 to the second question, dealing with the most important or fundamental superconformal models, namely: the supersymmetric free field, its rational extensions, conformal subnets of the fermionic free field net, and finally the super-Virasoro net with central charge $c \geq 3/2$. We explicitly construct super-KMS functionals on the quasi-local C*-algebra of those nets, based on the results in [RST69, BG07] and show uniqueness for some of them under certain additional regularity assumptions. As an essential ingredient and byproduct independent of the context of conformal nets, we find a generalization of Araki's criterion on quasi-equivalence of quasi-free states on the CAR algebra [Ara70] to a well-behaved class of (nonpositive but bounded) quasi-free functionals on the CAR algebra, cf. Theorem A.3.

As evident from the preceding discussion, question 3 will be impossible to answer. Concerning the last question, however, we can say quite a lot, and this will be the objective of Section 4. Inspired by [JLW89, BG07] we present a general construction of local-entire cyclic cocycles out of local-exponentially bounded super-KMS functionals, and we show that these cocycles are geometric invariants for certain "regular perturbations" of our dynamical system. We close our paper by illustrating the cocycle construction with some of the models studied in Section 3. A deeper investigation of the involved geometric invariants, probably related to index theory and possibly recovering parts of the representation theory as in [CHL12] has to be carried out in future works.

In order to keep this paper as concise as possible, we have postponed a lot of material to the appendix. In Appendix A we prove the above-mentioned generalization of Araki's quasi-equivalence criterion, in Appendix B we provide a classification of bounded super-KMS functionals for rational graded-local conformal nets over the circle S^1 with respect to the rotation group action, and finally in Appendix C we collect several lengthy and technical proofs of statements made in the main part of the text.

One final important remark: In the present paper, we deal with nets over $\mathbb{R}$, whose physical meaning is that of a light-ray in two-dimensional Minkowski spacetime, especially interesting for so-called chiral theories (cf. [Wei05] for a good overview). We restrict to this "spacetime" setting since our results in Sections 2 and 3 treat that quite ample case. However, most of the initial definitions here make sense also for nets over more general spacetimes with a designated (fixed) "translation direction". In fact, Proposition 2.6 and the results in Section 4 can be read in such a generalized context; yet since we do not treat examples (apart from a brief toy example on page 16) in that context and do not want to become too lengthy, we remain in the setting of light-rays and leave the corresponding generalizing reformulation of Section 4 to the interested reader.

2 General aspects of super-KMS functionals

Preliminaries and notation

Let $\mathcal{I}$ stand for the set of nontrivial bounded open intervals in $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{I}_S$ the set of nonempty nondense open intervals of the unit circle S^1 (sometimes regarded as being embedded in $\mathbb{C}$). We write

$$\mathcal{T}^1 := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : 0 \leq \Im z \leq 1\}$$

for the standard closed strip in the complex plane.

A *graded translation-covariant net $\mathcal{A}$ over* $\mathbb{R}$ is a map $I \mapsto \mathcal{A}(I)$ from the set $\mathcal{I}$ to the set of von Neumann algebras acting on a common infinite-dimensional separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying the following properties:

- *Isotony.* $\mathcal{A}(I_1) \subset \mathcal{A}(I_2)$ if $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$ and $I_1 \subset I_2$.
- *Grading covariance.* There exists a selfadjoint unitary Γ (the grading unitary) on $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying $\Gamma\mathcal{A}(I)\Gamma = \mathcal{A}(I)$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$. We write $\gamma = \operatorname{Ad}\Gamma$ and define the usual *graded commutator*

$$\begin{aligned}[x,y] = xy &+ \frac{1}{4}(y-\gamma(y))(x-\gamma(x)) - \frac{1}{4}(y+\gamma(y))(x-\gamma(x)) \\ &- \frac{1}{4}(y-\gamma(y))(x+\gamma(x)) - \frac{1}{4}(y+\gamma(y))(x+\gamma(x)), \quad x,y \in \mathcal{A}(I).\end{aligned}$$

- *Translation-covariance.* There is a strongly continuous unitary representation on $\mathcal{H}$ of the translation group $\mathbb{R}$ with infinitesimal generator P such that

$$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,tP}\,\mathcal{A}(I)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\,tP} = \mathcal{A}(t+I), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, I \in \mathcal{I},$$

  and the corresponding point-strongly continuous one-parameter automorphism group $(\alpha_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ (i.e., $t \mapsto \alpha_t(x)$ is σ-weakly continuous, for every $x \in \mathcal{A}(I)$) restricts to *-isomorphisms from $\mathcal{A}(I)$ to $\mathcal{A}(t+I)$, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}$, and is asymptotically graded-abelian (with respect to the graded commutator).
- *Positivity of the energy.* P is positive.

Although we work in this general context of graded translation-covariant nets over $\mathbb{R}$, we shall be particularly interested in the special case of superconformal nets over $\mathbb{R}$ or S^1. To this end, let $\mathrm{Diff}(S^1)$ be the group of orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms of S^1 and $\mathrm{Diff}(S^1)^{(\infty)}$ its universal covering group; then recall from [CKL08, CHKL10, CHL12] that a *graded-local conformal net $\mathcal{A}_S$ over* S^1 is a map $I \in \mathcal{I}_S \mapsto \mathcal{A}_S(I)$ as above but with the following additional properties:

- *Diffeomorphism-covariance.* There is a strongly continuous projective unitary representation $U : \mathrm{Diff}(S^1)^{(\infty)} \to B(\mathcal{H})$ extending the unitary representation of the translation group and such that

  $$U(g)\mathcal{A}_S(I)U(g)^* = \mathcal{A}_S(\dot{g}I), \quad g \in \mathrm{Diff}(S^1)^{(\infty)}, I \in \mathcal{I}_S,$$

  and

  $$U(g)xU(g)^* = x, \quad x \in \mathcal{A}_S(I'), g \in \mathrm{Diff}(S^1)^{(\infty)}_I, I \in \mathcal{I}_S.$$

  where $\mathrm{Diff}(S^1)^{(\infty)}_I$ denotes the $\mathbf{1}$-connected component of $\{g \in \mathrm{Diff}(S^1)^{(\infty)} : gz = z \ \forall z \in S^1 \setminus I\}$.

- *Existence and uniqueness of the vacuum.* There exists a U-invariant vector $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$ which is unique up to a phase and cyclic for $\bigvee_{I\in\mathcal{I}_S} \mathcal{A}_S(I)$.

- *Graded locality.* The grading unitary Γ satisfies additionally

  $$\mathcal{A}_S(I_1) \subset Z\mathcal{A}_S(I_2)'Z^*, \quad I \in \mathcal{I}, \bar{I}_1 \cap \bar{I}_2 = \emptyset,$$

  where

  $$Z := \frac{\mathbf{1} - \mathrm{i}\Gamma}{1 - \mathrm{i}}.$$

We shall treat super-KMS aspects of these nets in Appendix B.

Finally, a *graded-local conformal net $\mathcal{A}$ over* $\mathbb{R}$ is the net obtained by restricting $\mathcal{A}_S$ to $\mathcal{I}$, identifying $\mathbb{R}$ with $S^1 \setminus \{-1\}$ by means of the Cayley transform, and covariance is now with respect to the stabilizer subgroup of $\mathrm{Diff}(S^1)^{(\infty)}$ for the point -1. It is clearly a special case of a graded translation-covariant net. It is called *superconformal* if it contains the super-Virasoro net $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c}$ (defined first in [CKL08, Sec.6], cf. also Appendix C.2 here) as a diffeomorphism-covariant subnet with central charge c and the (restriction of the) projective representation U of $\mathrm{Diff}(S^1)^{(\infty)}$ making $\mathcal{A}$ diffeomorphism covariant satisfies

$$U(\mathrm{Diff}(S^1)^{(\infty)}_I) \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c}(I) \subset \mathcal{A}(I), \quad I \in \mathcal{I},$$

cf. [CHL12, Def.2.11]. There are several examples of such nets, cf. [CHL12, Sec.6], and we discuss some of them from the sKMS point of view in Section 3.

The *universal* or *quasi-local C*-algebra* corresponding to a (graded) net $\mathcal{A}$ over $\mathbb{R}$ is defined as the C*-direct limit

$$\mathfrak{A} := \lim_{\rightarrow} \mathcal{A}(I)$$

over $I \in \mathcal{I}$, cf. also [Haa92, BR97, CLTW11a], noting that $\mathcal{I}$ is directed (in contrast to $\mathcal{I}_S$). For all $I \in \mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{A}(I)$ is naturally identified with a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{A}$. When referring to particular models for $\mathcal{A}$, we shall say so explicitly. (We always use gothic letters for the quasi-local C*-algebra of the nets with corresponding calligraphic letter.)

As in [CLTW11a, Sec.2], which shall serve as guideline for many aspects of our setting, we write α again for the induced group of automorphisms of $\mathfrak{A}$, and we denote its infinitesimal generator by the derivation $(\delta_0, \mathrm{dom}(\delta_0))$, which is locally σ-weakly densely defined and locally (formally) given by the commutator with P. Furthermore, we write $\mathfrak{A}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{A}$ for the *-subalgebra of analytic elements of α (the elements $x \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \alpha_t(x) \in \mathfrak{A}$ extends to an entire analytic function), cf. [BR97, Sec.3.2].

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a graded translation-covariant net. A *superderivation* on $\mathfrak{A}$ with respect to the grading γ and translation group α is a linear map $\delta : \mathrm{dom}(\delta) \subset \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{A}$ such that:

(*i*) $\mathrm{dom}(\delta) \subset \mathfrak{A}$ is a *α-γ-invariant* (i.e., globally invariant under the action of every α_t, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, as well as γ) unital *-subalgebra, with

$$\alpha_t \circ \delta(x) = \delta \circ \alpha_t(x), \quad \gamma \circ \delta(x) = -\delta \circ \gamma(x), \quad \delta(x^*) = \gamma(\delta(x)^*), \quad x \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta), t \in \mathbb{R};$$

(ii) $\delta(xy) = \delta(x)y + \gamma(x)\delta(y)$, for all $x, y \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta)$,

(iii) $\delta_I := \delta \restriction_{\mathrm{dom}(\delta)\cap\mathcal{A}(I)}$ is a (σ-weakly)-(σ-weakly) closed σ-weakly densely defined operator on $\mathcal{A}(I)$ with image in $\mathcal{A}(I)$,

(iv) $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_I^\infty) := \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathrm{dom}(\delta_I^n) \subset \mathrm{dom}(\delta_0) \cap \mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{A}(I)$ is σ-weakly dense,

By $\mathrm{dom}(\cdot)_I$ we always mean $\mathrm{dom}(\cdot) \cap \mathcal{A}(I)$ and thus $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_I) = \mathrm{dom}(\delta)_I$; $\mathrm{dom}(\cdot)_c$ stands for the union over $I \in \mathcal{I}$ of $\mathrm{dom}(\cdot)_I$, which may actually be equal to $\mathrm{dom}(\delta)$. We then call $(\mathfrak{A}, \gamma, \alpha, \delta)$ shortly a *graded quantum dynamical system*. We shall be interested in modifications of the KMS condition on $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$, and we consider only the case of inverse temperature $\beta = 1$ (which can always be achieved by rescaling if $\beta \neq 0, \infty$), cf. also Remark 3.2. We shall deal with several examples of this setting in the following section.

All *-algebras in this paper are understood to be unital and all Hilbert spaces separable.

Super-KMS functionals

Super-KMS functionals are the central objects of this paper and we choose the following definition, which was motivated by the corresponding ones in [BL00, BG07] but is actually much stronger and more suitable for the theory and examples developed in this paper.

Definition 2.1. A *super-KMS functional* (in short sKMS functional) ϕ on $(\mathfrak{A}, \gamma, \alpha, \delta)$ is a linear functional defined on a *-subalgebra $\mathrm{dom}(\phi) \subset \mathfrak{A}$ such that:

(S_0) Domain properties: $\phi(x^*) = \overline{\phi(x)}$, for all $x \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)$; $\mathrm{dom}(\phi)_I \subset \mathcal{A}(I)$ is σ-weakly dense, for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$, and $\mathrm{dom}(\phi)$ is globally α-γ-invariant.

(S_1) Local normality: ϕ_I is bounded and extends to a normal (i.e., σ-weakly continuous) linear functional on $\mathcal{A}(I)$, denoted again ϕ_I, for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$.

(S_2) SKMS property: for every $x, y \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)$, there is a continuous function $F_{x,y}$ on the strip $\mathcal{T}^1$ which is analytic on the interior, satisfying

$$F_{x,y}(t) = \phi(x\alpha_t(y)), \quad F_{x,y}(t + \mathrm{i}) = \phi(\alpha_t(y)\gamma(x)), \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

and there are constants $C_0 > 0$ and $p_0 \in 2\mathbb{N}$ depending only on x, y, ϕ such that

$$|F_{x,y}(t)| \leq C_0(1 + |\Re(t)|)^{p_0}, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}^1.$$

(S_3) Normalization: $\phi(\mathbf{1}) = 1$.

(S_4) Derivation invariance: $\mathrm{im}(\delta_I) \subset \mathrm{dom}(\phi_I)$, for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$, and $\phi \circ \delta = 0$ on $\mathrm{dom}(\delta)_c$.

(S_5) Weak supersymmetry: for every $x, z \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)_c$ and $y \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^2)_c$, we have

$$\phi(x\delta^2(y)z) = -\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\phi(x\alpha_t(y)z) \restriction_{t=0} .$$

Some sKMS functionals exhibit the following additional properties:

(S_4') Dense derivation invariance: (S_4) holds and $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_I^\infty) = \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathrm{dom}(\delta_I^n) \subset \mathcal{A}(I)$ is σ-weakly dense, for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$.

(S_6) Local-exponential boundedness: there are suitable constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that $\|\phi \restriction_{\mathrm{dom}(\phi)_I}\|$ is bounded by $C_1\,\mathrm{e}^{C_2|I|^2}$, for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Here and throughout this paper we write $|I| := \sup\{|x| : x \in I\}$.

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a local conformal net with quasi-local C*-algebra $\mathfrak{B}$ and one-parameter automorphism group of time-translations α. A *KMS functional* ϕ on $(\mathfrak{B}, \alpha)$ is a linear functional defined on a *-subalgebra $\mathrm{dom}(\phi) \subset \mathfrak{B}$ satisfying (S_0)-(S_3) with $\gamma = \mathrm{id}_{\mathfrak{B}}$.

The theory of (usual) KMS states motivates the following proposition:

Proposition 2.2. *Let* $(\phi, \mathrm{dom}(\phi))$ *be a functional on the graded quantum dynamical system* $(\mathfrak{A}, \gamma, \alpha, \delta)$ *with properties* (S_0, S_1, S_3)*, and let* $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi} \subset \mathfrak{A}_\alpha \cap \mathrm{dom}(\phi)$ *be a *-subalgebra such that, for every* $x, y \in \mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi}$*, the function* $t \in \mathcal{T}^1 \mapsto \phi(x\alpha_t(y))$ *is continuous and analytic on the interior of* $\mathcal{T}^1$*. Consider the following condition:*

(S_2') *For all* $x, y \in \mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi}$*, we have*

$$\mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{t\to \mathrm{i}}\, \phi(x\alpha_t(y)) = \phi(y\gamma(x)),$$

and there are constants $C_0 > 0$ *and* $p_0 \in 2\mathbb{N}$ *such that*

$$|\phi(x\alpha_t(y))| \leq C_0(1 + |\Re(t)|)^{p_0}, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}^1.$$

Then (S_2) *implies* (S_2') *and, if* $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi} \cap \mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{A}(I)$ *is* σ*-weakly dense, for all* $I \in \mathcal{I}$*, and* (S_6) *holds for* ϕ*, then* (S_2') *implies* (S_2) *on* $\mathrm{dom}(\phi)_c$*. Moreover,* (S_2) *implies:*

(S_7) *Translation invariance:* $\phi \circ \alpha_t = \phi$ *on* $\mathrm{dom}(\phi)$*, for all* $t \in \mathbb{R}$*.*

(S_8) *Gradedness:* $\phi \circ \gamma = \phi$ *on* $\mathrm{dom}(\phi)$*.*

Finally, ϕ_I *may be uniquely extended to* $\mathcal{A}(I)$ *and* $\mathrm{dom}(\phi)_I$ *replaced by* $\mathcal{A}(I)$*, for every* $I \in \mathcal{I}$*.*

Properties (S_7) and (S_8) are proved in [BG07, Prop.5.3] and are in fact almost immediate consequences of (S_2). It follows in particular from that proof that (S_7) and (S_8) hold on a given α-γ-invariant *-subalgebra $A \subset \mathrm{dom}(\delta)$ instead of $\mathrm{dom}(\phi)$ if (S_2) holds on A. It is well-known [BR97, Prop.5.3.7] that in the case of states and trivial grading, property (S_2') is equivalent to (S_2), while in the present setting this is no longer true, owing to the unboundedness of ϕ and the fact that $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi} \cap \mathcal{A}(I)$ may be trivial. We postpone the proof to Appendix C.1.

We recall [BL00, Lem.2&Cor.8] adapted to the special case where the ϕ-asymptotically graded-abelian automorphism group is in fact asymptotically graded-abelian and given by translations – and this is independent of the choice or existence of a superderivation δ:

Proposition 2.3. *Let* $\mathcal{A}$ *be a (nontrivially) graded translation-covariant net. Then a nontrivial sKMS functional on* $\mathfrak{A}$ *with respect to translation must be nonpositive and unbounded.*

Graded-local conformal nets over $\mathbb{R}$ are a standard example for this setting in the following section of examples.

Let us look for a moment at completely rational (non-graded) local nets over $\mathbb{R}$. For the definition of complete rationality we refer to [KLM01]; we just emphasise that there are lots of examples of such nets. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be such a net with quasi-local C*-algebra $\mathfrak{B}$. The KMS states on $\mathfrak{B}$ with respect to translation were determined in [CLTW11a], and it turned out that there exists a unique one, the so-called *geometric KMS state* (defined e.g. in [CLTW11a, Sect.2.8]). One might ask what happens if we relax the requirement of KMS states to (bounded) KMS functionals; the answer is

Proposition 2.4. *Suppose* $\mathcal{B}$ *is a completely rational local conformal net over* $\mathbb{R}$*. Then every nontrivial bounded KMS functional on its quasi-local C*-algebra* $\mathfrak{B}$ *with respect to translation coincides with the geometric KMS state.*

Before entering the proof, recall (e.g. from [KR86, Th.4.3.6]) that every bounded functional ϕ on a C*-algebra $\mathfrak{B}$ has a unique (Jordan) decomposition $\phi = \phi_+ - \phi_-$ with $\phi_\pm$ mutually orthogonal positive functionals such that $\|\phi\| = \|\phi_+\| + \|\phi_-\|$.

Proof. Let ϕ be a bounded KMS functional on $\mathfrak{B}$; then we have a well-defined decomposition $\phi = \phi_+ - \phi_-$. As shown in [BL00, Lem.2], $|\phi| = \phi_+ + \phi_-$ satisfies the KMS condition on $\mathfrak{B}$; the positivity of $|\phi|$ implies moreover that it is a multiple of the unique (geometric) KMS state on $\mathfrak{B}$, cf. [CLTW11a]. Since $\phi_\pm = \frac{1}{2}(|\phi| \pm \phi)$ is the sum of two KMS functionals, it has to be a KMS functional again, although not necessarily normalized; by construction it is bounded and positive (although not necessarily faithful), so it has to be a multiple of the geometric KMS state, too, by the same reasoning as above. Thus ϕ, which is normalized, coincides with a multiple of the geometric KMS state. □

Remark 2.5. Notice that this is completely different for completely rational graded-local conformal nets over the circle S^1 with respect to the periodic rotation action (like those treated in [CKL08, CHKL10, CHL12]). In that case, there are in fact bounded though nonpositive sKMS functionals on the universal C*-algebra of the net (in its universal locally normal representation), and this is all explained in Appendix B.

The nonpositivity of sKMS functionals in general makes fundamental constructions like those by Moriya [Mor10, Mor11] difficult or impossible. He considers *supersymmetric states ϕ on C*-algebras*, i.e., satisfying $\phi \circ \delta = 0$, and in this case the GNS construction gives rise to supercharges for δ. An extension to the setting of nets of von Neumann algebras should be natural, but compatibility with the sKMS property cause problems like those mentioned above (nonpositivity) with which we cannot deal here in further detail.

Now let us return to sKMS functionals for more general nets.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a (nontrivially) graded translation-covariant net. Given an sKMS functional $(\phi, \mathrm{dom}(\phi))$ on $\mathfrak{A}$ for translation, the functionals $|\phi_I|$ and $\phi_I^\pm := \frac{1}{2}(|\phi_I| \pm \phi_I)$ obtained through restriction are individually well-defined, bounded and positive, but they do not form a directed system with respect to restriction, so they do not give rise to positive (unbounded) functionals on $\mathfrak{A}$.*

In particular, we have to point out that for this very reason the construction of $|\phi|$ suggested in [Sto07, Sec.4] does not work here.

Proof. By assumption (S_1), the local restrictions ϕ_I are bounded, so $|\phi_I|$ and $\phi_I^\pm$ are well-defined bounded positive functionals on $\mathcal{A}(I)$. Suppose $(\phi_I^\pm)_{I\in\mathcal{I}}$ forms a directed system, i.e., for every inclusion $\bar{I}_1 \subset I_2$ we have $\phi_{I_2}^\pm \restriction_{\mathcal{A}(I_1)} = \phi_{I_1}^\pm$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi_{I_1}\| =& \|\phi_{I_1}^+\| + \|\phi_{I_1}^-\| = \phi_{I_1}^+(\mathbf{1}) + \phi_{I_1}^-(\mathbf{1})\\ =& \phi_{I_2}^+ \restriction_{\mathcal{A}(I_1)} (\mathbf{1}) + \phi_{I_2}^- \restriction_{\mathcal{A}(I_1)} (\mathbf{1}) = \phi_{I_2}^+(\mathbf{1}) + \phi_{I_2}^-(\mathbf{1})\\ =& \|\phi_{I_2}^+\| + \|\phi_{I_2}^-\| = \|\phi_{I_2}\|,\end{aligned}$$

since $\mathbf{1} \in \bigcap_{I\in\mathcal{A}(I)} \mathcal{A}(I)$. But this would imply that $\|\phi_I\|$ does not depend on I, hence the boundedness of ϕ on $\mathfrak{A}$ as an inductive limit of functionals of the same norm – a contradiction to Proposition 2.3. So $\phi_I^\pm$ do not satisfy isotony, and neither do $|\phi_I|$, for $I \in \mathcal{I}$, and we cannot define unbounded positive functionals $\phi^\pm$ on $\mathfrak{A}$ as inductive limits such that $\phi = \phi^+ - \phi^-$. □

A classification of sKMS functionals in general seems to be out of reach without further specifications and without a general theory of unbounded linear functionals on C*-algebras. Already in the non-graded special case where $\mathcal{B}$ is a completely rational local net over $\mathbb{R}$, the question of existence and uniqueness of *(unbounded nonpositive) KMS functionals* on $\mathfrak{B}$ is not clear, whereas we know that there exists a unique *KMS state* on $\mathfrak{B}$ namely the geometric KMS state, cf. Proposition 2.4 and [CLTW11a]. An example of an unbounded KMS functional for a completely rational local conformal net will be encountered e.g. in Corollary 3.9 in the setting of the chiral Ising model, i.e., the even subnet of the free fermion net.

As it seems difficult to say much more about sKMS functionals or to obtain uniqueness results as for KMS states in general, we are rather forced to study individual models, and we shall do so in the following section. For physical reasons it makes sense to require certain additional properties, under which decent classification statements will become possible. We call them "regularity conditions" and they roughly mean that:

- a functional on a product net splits into a product functional;
- if the net comes from unbounded selfadjoint localized fields, then ϕ extends to polynomials in those fields via differentiation, one can recover ϕ from its value on those polynomials, and the relation $\phi \circ \delta = 0$ holds also on the unbounded fields.

The precise definition will be given when treating the individual models.

3 Models and super-KMS functionals

Fermions and quasi-free functionals

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a complex Hilbert space with a selfadjoint involution Γ. Then the *selfdual CAR algebra* $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K},\Gamma)$ is the C*-algebra generated by elements $F(f)$, for all $f \in \mathcal{K}$, which are linear in f and satisfy the canonical anticommutation relations

$$F(f)^*F(g) + F(g)F(f)^* = \langle f, g\rangle, \quad F(f)^* = F(\Gamma f), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{K}. \tag{3.1}$$

These relations define, in particular, the C*-norm on $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K},\Gamma)$. A *quasi-free state* on $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K},\Gamma)$ is a state which vanishes on all odd degree monomials of F and on those of even degree it satisfies

$$\phi(F(f_1)\cdots F(f_{2n})) = \sum_{j=2}^{2n} (-1)^j \phi(F(f_1)F(f_j)) \cdot \phi\Big(\prod_{i\neq 1,j} F(f_i)\Big). \tag{3.2}$$

It is thus completely determined by its sesquilinear 2-point function, which in turn corresponds to a unique operator $S \in B(\mathcal{K})$ such that $0 \leq S = S^* \leq \mathbf{1}$, $\Gamma S \Gamma = \mathbf{1} - S$ and $\phi(F(f)^*F(g)) = \langle f, Sg\rangle$, cf. [Ara70] for further information. By a *quasi-free functional* on $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K},\Gamma)$ we shall mean a linear functional ϕ whose domain $\mathrm{dom}(\phi) \subset \mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K},\Gamma)$ contains the *-algebra generated by monomials $F(f_1)\cdots F(f_n)$, $f_i \in \mathcal{K}_0$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (where $\mathcal{K}_0 \subset \mathcal{K}$ is a certain dense vector subspace); moreover, ϕ has to vanish on all odd degree monomials and its value on even degree monomials is defined as in (3.2) but with

$$\phi(F(f)^*F(g)) = \theta(f, g), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{K}_0,$$

where $\theta : \mathrm{dom}(\theta) \to \mathbb{C}$ is a sesquilinear map such that $\mathcal{K}_0 \times \mathcal{K}_0 \subset \mathrm{dom}(\theta) \subset \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K}$ is dense and $\theta(f, g) = \overline{\theta(g, f)}$. In case θ is bounded and $\mathrm{dom}(\theta) = \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K}$, there is clearly a corresponding operator $S \in B(\mathcal{K})$ such that $S^* = S = \mathbf{1} - \Gamma S \Gamma$ and $\theta = \langle \cdot, S \cdot \rangle$. The other way round, any such S uniquely determines a bounded quasi-free functional on $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}, \Gamma)$, which we denote by ϕ_S; it is a state iff moreover $0 \leq S \leq \mathbf{1}$.

From now on, let $\mathcal{K} = L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^d)$, with $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{K}_I = L^2(I, \mathbb{C}^d) \subset \mathcal{K}$ and $\Gamma : f \mapsto \bar{f}$ component-wise complex conjugation on $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{K}_I$, write $\mathcal{K}^\Gamma = L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{K}_I^\Gamma = L^2(I, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^d)$ be the corresponding Schwartz space (of $\mathbb{C}^d$-valued rapidly decreasing functions on $\mathbb{R}$), a dense vector subspace of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$. For $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ or $\mathbb{C}^d$, we write $\mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R}, X)$ for those Schwartz functions which have actually compact support, $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, X)_I$ for those with support in given $I \in \mathcal{I}$, and shortly $\mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R}) := \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$.

We define the operator

$$P_+ : f \in \mathcal{K} \mapsto (\chi_{[0,\infty)} \cdot \hat{f})^\vee \in \mathcal{K}, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\hat{f}, f^\vee \in \mathcal{K}$ denote the Fourier transform (inverse Fourier transform, respectively) of $f \in \mathcal{K}$. Then ϕ_{P_+} is a quasi-free state, the vacuum state, and we call its GNS representation $\pi_{\phi_{P_+}}$ the *vacuum representation* of $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}, \Gamma)$. We fix the grading automorphism γ and the translation automorphism group α by

$$\gamma(F(f)) = -F(f), \quad \alpha_t(F(f)) = F(f(t + \cdot)), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, f \in \mathcal{K}.$$

Let us consider the sKMS property (S_2) for $(\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}, \Gamma), \gamma, \alpha)$:

Proposition 3.1. *There exists a unique quasi-free functional* ϕ *on* $(\mathrm{CAR}(L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^d), \Gamma), \gamma, \alpha)$ *with*

$$\mathrm{dom}(\phi) := {}^*\text{-alg}\{F(f) : f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^d)\}$$

satisfying properties $(S_0), (S_2), (S_3)$ *with norm instead of* σ*-weak denseness. Its two-point function is*

$$\theta(f, g) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} \Big(\int_{-\infty}^{-\varepsilon} + \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \Big) \frac{1}{1 - \mathrm{e}^{-p}} \overline{\hat{f}(p)} \hat{g}(p) \, \mathrm{d}\, p, \quad f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^d). \tag{3.4}$$

The proof is deferred to Appendix C.2.

Remark 3.2. In order to understand what happens at the thermodynamical limit of inverse temperature $\beta \to 0$, it is necessary to study the functionals satisfying the sKMS condition (S_2) at inverse temperature $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$. In this case (analogously to the case of inverse temperature 1), there is unique sKMS functional ϕ_β and its two-point function is given by

$$\theta_\beta(f, g) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} \Big(\int_{-\infty}^{-\varepsilon} + \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \Big) \frac{1}{1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\beta p}} \overline{\hat{f}(p)} \hat{g}(p) \, \mathrm{d}\, p, \quad f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^d).$$

We then calculate

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\, \beta} \phi_\beta(\mathbf{1}) = 0, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

cf. (C.4) in the proof of Proposition 3.1. Since for super-Gibbs functionals (cf. Appendix B) with Hamiltonian H this final equation becomes $-\operatorname{tr}(\Gamma H \, \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H}) = 0$, it may be widely interpreted in the sense that there is no supersymmetry breaking (supersymmetric phase transition) between fermions and bosons; on the other hand, the thermal phase transition behavior of the quantum system as such is still described by the classical (not "super") KMS condition. For further explanations and relations to supersymmetric Ward identities we refer the reader to [Fuc84, Secs.3&9], yet some future work has to carried out in order to understand this point deeper. The models in the following subsections can be treated similarly.

The operators $F(f) \in \mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}, \Gamma)$ define the *d-fermion free field net $\mathcal{F}$ over* $\mathbb{R}$, namely

$$\mathcal{F}(I) := \{\pi_{P_+}(F(f)) : f \in \mathcal{K}_I^\Gamma\}'', \quad I \in \mathcal{I},$$

which is a graded-local conformal net, with grading and translation automorphisms the ones induced by γ and α, cf. [Böc96, CKL08] for further information. Following our above convention, we write $\mathfrak{F}$ for the quasi-local C*-algebra of the net $\mathcal{F}$.

Theorem 3.3. *There is a functional $\phi_{\mathcal{F}}$ on $\mathfrak{F}$ satisfying $(S_0) - (S_3)$ and (S_6). Requiring quasi-freeness and*

$$\mathrm{dom}(\phi_{\mathcal{F}}) \supset \{\pi_{P_+}(F(f)) : f \in \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)\},$$

it is even unique.

The proof is again deferred to Appendix C.2.

Supersymmetric free field net

Consider the C*-algebra generated by elements $W(f)$, for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$, satisfying the relations

$$W(f)W(g) = \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\langle f', g\rangle} W(f+g), \quad W(f)^* = W(-\Gamma f).$$

We denote the vacuum Fock space representation by $(\pi_{0,\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}})$. The *d-bosonic free field* is generated by the Weyl operators $W(f)$ in the vacuum representation $\pi_{0,\mathcal{B}}$, namely

$$\mathcal{B}(I) = \{\pi_{0,\mathcal{B}}(W(f)) : f \in \mathcal{S}(I, \mathbb{R}^d)\}'', \quad I \in \mathcal{I},$$

and it is a local conformal net (i.e., with trivial grading) with translation automorphisms defined through $\alpha_t(\pi_{0,\mathcal{B}}(W(f))) = \pi_{0,\mathcal{B}}(W(f(t+\cdot)))$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}, f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$, cf. [BMT88, FG93, Xu05] for further information. We remark that, for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$, $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \pi_{0,\mathcal{B}}(W(tf)) \in B(\mathcal{H}_0)$ is a strongly continuous one-parameter group of unitaries, and we write $J(f)$ for its (unbounded selfadjoint) infinitesimal generator. All $J(f)$ are linear in f with a common invariant core $\mathcal{D}_\infty$ as discussed below and satisfying the canonical commutation relations on $\mathcal{D}_\infty$:

$$[J(f), J(g)] = \mathrm{i}\langle f, g'\rangle, \quad f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d),$$

cf. [BR97, Sec.5.2] and [CLTW11b, Sec.4]. Note that $(f,g) \mapsto \langle f, g'\rangle$ clearly defines a symplectic form on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Following our above convention, we write $\mathfrak{B}$ for the quasi-local C*-algebra corresponding to the net $\mathcal{B}$.

We let $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ be the supersymmetric free field net for the rest of this subsection, and we usually identify $\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathbf{1}$ with $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathbf{1} \otimes F(f)$ with $F(f)$ and $J(f) \otimes \mathbf{1}$ with $J(f)$. Moreover, we write $F(f)$ for $\pi_{\phi_{P_+}}(F(f))$ henceforth and $W(f)$ for $\pi_{0,\mathcal{B}}(W(f))$, all of them acting on the vacuum Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}}$. Grading and translation automorphisms on $\mathfrak{A}$ are given by tensor product of the corresponding ones on $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{F}$, and we denote them again by γ and α_t.

We first claim that *$\mathcal{A}$ is a superconformal net over* $\mathbb{R}$. This can be shown in complete analogy to [CHL12, Prop.&Def.6.2] (which in turn is based on the super-Sugawara construction in [KT85]): we only have to regard the involved formulae for fields over $\mathbb{R}$ instead of S^1 there, and moreover the involved Lie groups $\mathrm{U}(1)^d$ instead of a simple simply-connected Lie group G of dimension d there. To be just slightly more precise, the super-Sugawara construction in [KT85, Th.4] defines super-Virasoro generators in terms of the free field generators and satisfying the (graded) commutation relations (C.5) and (C.6) on $\mathcal{D}_\infty$. Additionally, they satisfy linear energy bounds, and proceeding in the standard way applying [DF77, Th.3.1], we see that they define a graded-local subnet $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c}$

of $\mathcal{A}$ with $c = \frac{3}{2}d$. Using the action of the diffeomorphism group on the generators, we can proceed as in [CKL08, Sec.6.3] to show that the nets are diffeomorphism-covariant, w.r.t. the same projective representation U of $\mathrm{Diff}(S^1)^{(\infty)}$. And according to [CKL08, Sec.6.3], $U(\mathrm{Diff}(S^1)^{(\infty)}_I) \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c}(I)$. Thus, $\mathcal{A}$ is superconformal according to the definition in Section 2.

We would like to have a superderivation δ satisfying formally

$$\delta(J(f)) = \mathrm{i}\, F(f'), \quad \delta(F(f)) = J(f), \quad f \in \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d), \tag{3.5}$$

and in terms of von Neumann algebras

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(W(f)) =& - F(f')W(f), \\ \delta(F(f)(J(f)+\mathrm{i})^{-1}) =& J(f)(J(f)+\mathrm{i})^{-1} - \mathrm{i}\, F(f)F(f')(J(f)+\mathrm{i})^{-2} \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

on the generators of the *-subalgebra $\mathfrak{A}_0 \cap \mathcal{A}(I)$, where

$$\mathfrak{A}_0 := \ ^*\text{-alg}\{W(f), F(f)(J(f)-\mathrm{i})^{-1} : f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)\}. \tag{3.7}$$

Lemma 3.4. *There is a family $(Q_I)_{I\in\mathcal{I}}$ of (unbounded) odd selfadjoint operators on $\mathcal{H}$ such that:*

- *there is a corresponding family of superderivations $(\delta_{Q_I})_{I\in\mathcal{I}}$ with $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_{Q_I})$ given by all $x \in \mathcal{A}(I)$ for which there is $y \in \mathcal{A}(I)$ with*

  $$\gamma(x)Q_I \subset Q_I x - y, \tag{3.8}$$

  and in this case $\delta_{Q_I}(x) := y$;

- *δ_{Q_I} satisfies* (3.6)*, for all $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)_I$, and $\delta_{Q_{I_2}} \restriction_{\mathrm{dom}(\delta_{Q_{I_1}})} = \delta_{Q_{I_1}}$, for all $I_1 \subset I_2$.*

Every δ_{Q_I} is (σ-weak)-(σ-weakly) closed.

The proof (in Appendix C.2) is based on the fact that $\mathcal{A}$ is diffeomorphism-covariant and superconformal, so that it contains the super-Virasoro net as conformal subnet, which gives rise to the elements Q_I.

Lemma 3.5. *Given the above family $(Q_I)_{I\in\mathcal{I}}$, an interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$ symmetric around* 0*, $x \in \mathfrak{A}_0 \cap \mathcal{A}(\frac{1}{2}I)$ and $h \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_{\frac{1}{2}I}$, let*

$$x_h := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha_t(x)h(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,t.$$

Then $x_h \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^m_{Q_I})$, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\delta^2_{Q_I} \subset \delta_0$, and we have

$$\delta^{2n}_{Q_I}(x_h) = (\mathrm{i})^n x_{h^{(n)}}, \quad \delta^{2n+1}_{Q_I}(x_h) = (\mathrm{i})^n (\delta_{Q_I}(x))_{h^{(n)}}.$$

The proof is placed again in Appendix C.2.

For certain reasons to be explained later in the proof of Theorem 3.7, $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_{Q_I})$ is too large for our purposes, while $\mathfrak{A}_0 \cap \mathcal{A}(I)$ is too small since it intersects probably trivially with $\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty_{Q_I})$. A suitable domain is given by the following intermediate one, namely: setting

$$A(I) := \ ^*\text{-alg}\{x_h, (\delta(x))_h \in \mathcal{A}(I) : x \in \mathfrak{A}_0 \cap \mathcal{A}(I), h \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_I\},$$

we define

$$\delta_I := (\sigma\text{-weak})\text{-}(\sigma\text{-weak})\text{closure } (\delta_{Q_I} \restriction_{A(I)}), \tag{3.9}$$

and

$$\mathrm{dom}(\delta) := \bigcup_{I\in\mathcal{I}} \mathrm{dom}(\delta_I), \tag{3.10}$$

which is clearly a *-algebra, since every $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_I)$ is so and $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_{I_1}) \subset \mathrm{dom}(\delta_{I_2})$ if $I_1 \subset I_2$. By construction, $\mathrm{dom}(\delta) = \mathrm{dom}(\delta)_c$.

Proposition 3.6. *The family* $(\delta_I)_{I\in\mathcal{I}}$ *from* (3.9) *induces a unique superderivation* δ *on* $\mathrm{dom}(\delta)$ *satisfying conditions (i)-(iv). Moreover,* $\mathfrak{A}_0 \subset \mathrm{dom}(\delta)$ *and* $x_h \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta_I^\infty)$ *if* $x \in \mathfrak{A}_0 \cap \mathcal{A}(\frac{1}{2}I)$ *and* $h \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_{\frac{1}{2}I}$.

Since we find the proof quite instructive, we do not postpone it to the Appendix as usual.

Proof. Since $\delta_{I_1} \subset \delta_{I_2}$ if $I_1 \subset I_2$, and every element $x \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta)$ lies in some local algebra $\mathcal{A}(I)$, δ acts on x as the suitable graded commutator δ_{Q_I}. For such superderivations the general theory in [CHKL10, Prop.2.1] applies. Thus, once we have shown the global α-γ-invariance of the *-algebra $\mathrm{dom}(\delta)$, properties (i), (ii), (iv) of superderivations follow, while (iii) holds by definition of $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_I)$ in (3.9).

α-invariance of $\mathfrak{A}_0$ and its image $\delta(\mathfrak{A}_0)$ is clear from (3.7). Given $x \in \mathfrak{A}_0 \cap \mathcal{A}(\frac{1}{2}I)$ and $h \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_{\frac{1}{2}I}$, let $J \in \mathcal{I}$ contain I and $t + I$; then using the invariance of $\mathfrak{A}_0$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma\alpha_t\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha_s(x) f(s)\,\mathrm{d}\,s\Big) Q_J\xi =& \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma\alpha_{t+s}(x) f(s)\,\mathrm{d}\,s\Big) Q_J\xi\\
=& \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha_{t+s}(\gamma(x) Q_{J-t-s})\xi\Big) f(s)\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\
=& \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha_{t+s}(Q_{J-t-s}x + \delta_{Q_{J-t-s}}(x))\xi\Big) f(s)\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\
=& \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} (Q_J\alpha_{t+s}(x) + \delta_J(\alpha_{t+s}(x)))\xi\Big) f(s)\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\
=& Q_J\alpha_t(x_h)\xi + \delta_J(\alpha_t(x_h))\xi,
\end{aligned}$$

so $\alpha_t(x_h) \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta)$ and $\delta(\alpha_t(x) = \alpha_t(\delta(x))$; γ-invariance is shown in a similar way. Finally, let $x \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta_I)$, for some $I \in \mathcal{I}$, and consider a sequence $x_n \in A(I)$ converging σ-weakly to x and such that $\delta(x_n)$ converges σ-weakly to some element in $\mathcal{A}(I)$, which has to be $\delta_I(x)$ due to σ-weak closedness of δ_I, and in particular they converge weakly. Then σ-weak continuity of α_t implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \eta, \gamma\alpha_t(x) Q_J\xi\rangle =& \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \eta, \gamma\alpha_t(x_n) Q_J\xi\rangle\\
=& \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \eta, Q_J\alpha_t(x_n)\xi\rangle + \langle \eta, \delta_J(\alpha_t(x_n))\xi\rangle\\
=& \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \eta, Q_J\alpha_t(x_n)\xi\rangle + \langle \eta, \alpha_t(\delta_{J-t}(x_n))\xi\rangle\\
=& \langle \eta, Q_J\alpha_t(x)\xi\rangle + \langle \eta, \alpha_t(\delta(x))\xi\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\eta, \xi \in \mathcal{D}_\infty$, which means that $\alpha_t(x) \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta)$ and $\delta(\alpha_t(x)) = \alpha_t(\delta(x))$.

It only remains to prove property (iv), i.e., the σ-weak denseness of $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_I^\infty) \subset \mathcal{A}(I)$. By definition of $\mathcal{A}$ it is clear that $\mathfrak{A}_0 \cap \mathcal{A}(I)$ is σ-weakly dense in $\mathcal{A}(I)$. Moreover, every element $x \in \mathfrak{A}_0$ can be approximated σ-weakly by a sequence $(x_{h_n})_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)$, namely: let $I \in \mathcal{I}$ be such that $x \in \mathcal{A}(I)$, and let $h_n \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_{(-1,1)}$ be a sequence such that $h_n(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,t$ converges *-weakly to the Dirac measure $\mathrm{d}_\delta\, t$ in 0. Then σ-weak continuity of $t \mapsto \alpha_t(x)$ implies

$$x_{h_n} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha_t(x) h_n(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,t \to x \quad (\sigma\text{-weakly}), n \to \infty,$$

and every x_{h_n} lies in $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_I^\infty)$, so we are done.

The final statement in the proposition follows from Lemma 3.5 and (3.9): for $x_h \in A(I)$, we have $\delta_I(x_h) = \delta_{Q_I}(x_h) = (\delta_{Q_I}(x))_h \in A(I)$ with $\delta_I(\delta_I(x_h)) = \delta_{Q_I}(\delta_{Q_I}(x_h)) = \mathrm{i}\, x_{h'} \in A(I)$. Iterating this procedure, we see that $x_h \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta_I^m)$, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\delta_I^m(x_h) = \delta_{Q_I}^m(x_h)$ ☐

We come now to the regularity condition mentioned towards the end of Section 2. Let us call a functional ψ on $\mathfrak{B} \otimes \mathfrak{F}$ *δ-regular* if it splits into a quasi-free product functional $\psi_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes \psi_{\mathcal{F}}$, its domain contains $\mathfrak{B}_0 \odot \mathfrak{F}_0$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}_0 &= {}^*\text{-alg}\{F(f) : f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)\} \subset \mathfrak{F}, \\ \mathfrak{B}_0 &= {}^*\text{-alg}\{W(f), (J(f) - \mathrm{i})^{-1} : f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)\} \subset \mathfrak{B}, \end{aligned}$$

cf. Proposition 3.1, and $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \psi(W(tf)x)$ is analytic, for every $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and x a product of resolvents in $\mathfrak{B}$; more precisely, ψ can be extended to the unbounded monomials of the form $J(f_1) \cdots J(f_n) F(f_{n+1}) \cdots F(f_{n+m})$, for all $f_i \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)_c$ (for which $F(f_i)(J(f_i) + \mathrm{i})^{-1} \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta)$), and their image under δ, namely:

$$\begin{aligned} &\psi\big(J(f_1) \cdots J(f_n) F(f_{n+1}) \cdots F(f_{n+m})\big) \\ &\quad := \mathrm{i}^{m-n} \frac{\mathrm{d}^{n+m}}{\mathrm{d}\, t_1 \cdots \mathrm{d}\, t_{n+m}} \psi\Big(W(t_1 f_1) \cdots W(t_n f_n) \cdot \\ &\qquad \cdot F(t_{n+1} f_{n+1})\, \mathrm{i}(J(t_{n+1} f_{n+1}) + \mathrm{i})^{-1} \cdots F(t_{n+m} f_{n+m})\, \mathrm{i}(J(t_{n+m} f_{n+m}) + \mathrm{i})^{-1}\Big) \restriction_{t=0}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\psi(W(f))$ can be constructed from the values on such monomials, and analogously

$$\begin{aligned} &\psi \circ \delta\big(J(f_1) \cdots J(f_n) F(f_{n+1}) \cdots F(f_{n+m})\big) \\ &\quad := \mathrm{i}^{m-n} \frac{\mathrm{d}^{n+m}}{\mathrm{d}\, t_1 \cdots \mathrm{d}\, t_{n+m}} \psi \circ \delta\Big(W(t_1 f_1) \cdots W(t_n f_n) \cdot \\ &\qquad \cdot F(t_{n+1} f_{n+1})\, \mathrm{i}(J(t_{n+1} f_{n+1}) + \mathrm{i})^{-1} \cdots F(t_{n+m} f_{n+m})\, \mathrm{i}(J(t_{n+m} f_{n+m}) + \mathrm{i})^{-1}\Big) \restriction_{t=0}, \end{aligned}$$

for every $f_i \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)_c$. We see that, under assumption (S_4):

$$\psi \circ \delta\big(J(f_1) \cdots J(f_n) F(f_{n+1}) \cdots F(f_{n+m})\big) = 0.$$

We come now to the main result of the present section, which we therefore prove right here:

Theorem 3.7. *There is a unique nontrivial δ-regular sKMS functional for the graded-local net $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ satisfying (S_4'). Furthermore, it satisfies (S_6) and is given by the product of the geometric KMS state $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ on $\mathfrak{B}$ and the quasi-free functional $\phi_{\mathcal{F}}$ with two-point functions* (3.4) *on $\mathfrak{F}$.*

Proof. We first consider existence. Let $\psi = \phi_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes \phi_{\mathcal{F}}$ be the product of the unique geometric KMS state $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ on $\mathfrak{B}$ and the functional $\phi_{\mathcal{F}}$ constructed above on $\mathfrak{F}$. The local normality and δ-regularity of $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ are well-known facts (because it is a KMS state), while local normality, sKMS property and quasi-freeness of $\phi_{\mathcal{F}}$ have been shown in Theorem 3.3. Polynomial boundedness of the sKMS function and local-exponential boundedness of $\phi_{\mathcal{F}}$ have been established in [BG07, Th.5.7], and δ-regularity of ψ is an obvious consequence of its definition and the δ-regularity of $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Let us turn to derivation invariance (S_4'). Based on [BG07, Th.5.8] we prove in Appendix C.2 that

$$\psi_I \delta_I(x) = 0, \quad x \in B(I) := {}^*\text{-alg}\{y, \delta(y) : y \in \mathfrak{A}_0 \cap \mathcal{A}(I)\},$$

for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$. On elements of the form $x_{1,h_1} \cdots x_{n,h_n}$, with $x_i \in B(I)$ and $h_i \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_I$, we find then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_I \delta_I(x_{1,h_1} \cdots x_{n,h_n}) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi\delta(\alpha_{t_1}(x_1) \cdots \alpha_{t_n}(x_n)) h_1(t_1) \cdots h_n(t_n)\, \mathrm{d}^n\, t \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} 0 \cdot h_1(t_1) \cdots h_n(t_n)\, \mathrm{d}^n\, t = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\psi_I \delta_I = 0$ on the (σ-weak)-(σ-weak) closure $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_I)$, and $\psi\delta = 0$ on $\mathrm{dom}(\delta)_c$. Concerning (S_5), recall from Lemma 3.4 that

$$\delta_I^2(y) = \delta_0(y) = -\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\alpha_t(y)\restriction_{t=0}, \quad y \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta_I^2),$$

so (S_5) holds on every $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_I^m)$, $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, thus on $\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$.

Uniqueness is more involved. The requirement of being a δ-regular sKMS functional forces the restriction to $\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathfrak{F}$ to be a densely defined functional $\psi_{\mathcal{F}}$ with $\mathfrak{F}_0 \subset \mathrm{dom}(\psi_{\mathcal{F}})$, so it has to be $\phi_{\mathcal{F}}$ constructed in Theorem 3.3 as shown there. We have to determine $\psi_{\mathcal{B}}$. Owing to δ-regularity we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(J(f_1)\cdots J(f_{2n})) &= \mathrm{i}^{-2n}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2n}}{\mathrm{d}\,t_1\cdots \mathrm{d}\,t_{2n}}\psi(W(t_1f_1)\cdots W(t_{2n}f_{2n}))\restriction_{t=0}\\
&= \mathrm{i}^{2-2n}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2n}}{\mathrm{d}\,t_1\cdots \mathrm{d}\,t_{2n}}\psi\circ\delta\Big(F(t_1f_1)(J(t_1f_1)+\mathrm{i})^{-1}W(t_1f_1)\cdots W(t_{2n}f_{2n})\Big)\\
&\quad -\sum_{k=2}^{2n}\psi\Big(F(t_1f_1)(J(t_1f_1)+\mathrm{i})^{-1}W(t_1f_1)\cdots F(t_kf_k')W(t_kf_k)\cdots W(t_{2n}f_{2n})\Big)\Big)\restriction_{t=0}\\
&= 0-\sum_{k=2}^{2n}\psi(F(f_1)F(f_k'))\cdot\\
&\quad\cdot\,\mathrm{i}^{2-n}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2n}}{\mathrm{d}\,t_1\cdots \mathrm{d}\,t_{2n}}\psi\Big((J(t_1f_1)+\mathrm{i})^{-1}t_1W(t_1f_1)\cdots t_kW(t_kf_k)\cdots W(t_{2n}f_{2n})\Big)\restriction_{t=0}\\
&= \mathrm{i}^{2-n}\sum_{k=2}^{2n}\psi(F(f_1)F(f_k'))\psi(J(f_2)\cdots J(\check{f_k})\cdots J(f_{2n}))\\
&= \mathrm{i}^{n}\sum_{\sigma\in P_{2n}}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\phi_{\mathcal{F}}(F(f_{\sigma(j)})F(f'_{\sigma(n+j)}))\\
&= \mathrm{i}^{n}\sum_{\sigma\in P_{2n}}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\theta(f_{\sigma(j)},f'_{\sigma(n+j)}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $P_{2n} = \{\sigma \in S_{2n} : \sigma(1) < ... < \sigma(n), \sigma(j) < \sigma(j+n), j = 1, ..., n\}$. By an analogous reasoning

$$\psi(J(f_1)\cdots J(f_{2n+1})) = \mathrm{i}^n \sum_{k=1}^{2n+1}\sum_{\sigma\in P_{2n}^k}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\phi_{\mathcal{F}}(F(f_{\sigma(j)})F(f_{\sigma(n+j)}))\psi(J(f_k)),$$

where $P_{2n}^k = \{\sigma \in S_{2n+1} :\ j = \sigma(j) < \sigma(j+n+1), j = 1, ..., k-1;\ k = \sigma(k) < ... < \sigma(n+1), \sigma(j) < \sigma(j+n), j = k, ..., n+1\}$. But

$$\psi_{\mathcal{B}}(J(f)) = \psi(J(f)) = \psi\big(\delta(F(f))\big) = 0,$$

so $\psi_{\mathcal{B}}$ vanishes on all monomials with an odd number of factors $J(f)$. Thus, together with the above expression, we see that $\psi_{\mathcal{B}}$ is quasi-free, i.e., for all $f_i \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\psi_{\mathcal{B}}(J(f_1)\cdots J(f_{2n})) = \sum_{\sigma\in P_{2n}}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\psi_{\mathcal{B}}(J(f_{\sigma(j)})J(f_{\sigma(n+j)})),$$

with two-point function

$$(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)^2 \mapsto \psi_{\mathcal{B}}(J(f_1)J(f_2)) = \mathrm{i}\,\theta(f_1, f_2'). \tag{3.11}$$

The functional $\psi_{\mathcal{B}}$ is now completely determined on the algebra of unbounded smeared fields. By assumption it is δ-regular and thus analytic, so it extends uniquely to a functional on the algebra of the bosonic free field $\mathfrak{B}$. Since the two-point function of $\psi_{\mathcal{B}}$ coincides with that of the (quasi-free) geometric KMS state $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ on $\mathfrak{B}$ (cf. e.g. [CLTW11b, Sec.4]), which is also analytic, we see that it extends to the same functional on $\mathfrak{B}$, so $\psi_{\mathcal{B}}$ has to be the geometric KMS state $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}$; in particular, $\psi = \phi_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes \phi_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\mathrm{dom}(\psi) \supset \mathfrak{B} \odot \mathrm{dom}(\phi_{\mathcal{F}})$. Actually we may even choose $\mathrm{dom}(\psi)_I = \mathcal{A}(I)$ due to local boundedness of ψ on the local σ-weakly dense *-subalgebra $\mathcal{B}(I) \odot \mathcal{F}(I) \subset \mathcal{A}(I)$. □

Supersymmetric free field in higher dimensions

This subsection serves as an almost trivial illustration of many feasible generalizations to higher-dimensional (proper) spacetimes M instead of the light ray $\simeq \mathbb{R}$. Of course, more meaningful models should be studied in future.

Let us consider n-dimensional Minkowski spacetime M, with spacetime regions given by double cones as usual [Haa92]; we may consider for every double cone an enveloping cube, given by $I_1 \times ... \times I_n$, and therefore let $\mathcal{I}_n$ denote the set of direct products of bounded open intervals in $\mathbb{R}$. The net $\mathcal{A}_n$ over $\mathcal{I}_n$ here is defined simply as the graded tensor product net on $\mathcal{H}_n = \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ of the construction in the preceding subsection with $d = 1$, namely

$$\mathcal{A}_n(I_1 \times ... \times I_n) := \bigotimes_{i=1}^{n} \{\pi_{0,\mathcal{B}}(W(f)), \pi_{P_+}(F(f)) : f \in \mathcal{S}(I_i, \mathbb{R})\}'', \tag{3.12}$$

and so are the grading and translation automorphisms (diagonal translation):

$$\gamma^{(n)} = \gamma \otimes \cdots \otimes \gamma, \quad \alpha_t^{(n)} = \alpha_t \otimes \cdots \otimes \alpha_t.$$

In this case, the super-Virasoro generators are given by sums of the one-dimensional ones, in particular the local supercharge is

$$Q_{I_1 \times ... \times I_n} = G(\phi_{I_1}) \otimes \mathbf{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{1} + ... + \mathbf{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{1} \otimes G(\phi_{I_n})$$

and defines the superderivation $\delta^{(n)}$ corresponding to $Q_{I_1 \times ... \times I_n}$, as in Lemma 3.4. Then it is easy to see that the tensor product of the functionals in Theorem 3.7 defines an sKMS functional on the corresponding quasi-local algebra $\mathfrak{A}_n$ satisfying all properties in Definition 2.1 including local-exponential boundedness.

Rational extensions of the free field net

Let us consider the bosonic free field net $\mathcal{B}$ over $\mathbb{R}$ together with the whole construction in the preceding subsections setting $d = 1$. Its completely rational local extensions are classified in [BMT88, Sec.4] (cf. also [Xu05, Sec.4]) and given by nets $\mathcal{B}_N$ on $\mathcal{H}^{\oplus \mathbb{Z}} \simeq \mathcal{H}$, with $N \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$\mathcal{B}_N(I) := \{B(f) : f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_I, \int_{\mathbb{R}} f \in \sqrt{2N}\mathbb{Z}\}'', \quad I \in \mathcal{I}.$$

and $B(f)$ are unitary operators on $\mathcal{H}^{\oplus \mathbb{Z}}$ defined in [BMT88, Sec.3] (denoted there by the symbol ψ_ρ^ξ with $\rho = f$ and $\xi = -1$). They satisfy the relations

$$B(f_1)B(f_2) = \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\mathcal{T}(f_1,f_2)}\, B(f_1 + f_2), \quad f_i \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_I, \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_i \in \sqrt{2N}\mathbb{Z},$$

with a certain real-valued function $\mathcal{T}$ as in [BMT88, (3.34)]. In particular, $B(g') = W(g)$ up to a complex phase, for every $g \in \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R})$, which shows that $B(I) \subset \mathcal{B}_N(I)$. The automorphism group of translations acts by $\alpha_t^N(B(f)) = B(f(\cdot + t))$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and the grading by $\gamma_N(B(f)) = B(f)$.

As shown in [CLTW11a], the geometric KMS state $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ on $\mathfrak{B}$ extends to the geometric KMS state $\phi_{\mathcal{B}_N}$ on $\mathfrak{B}_N$ by $\phi_{\mathcal{B}_N,I} = \phi_{\mathcal{B},I} \circ E_{N,I}$, where $E_{N,I} : \mathcal{B}_N(I) \to \mathcal{B}(I)$ is the vacuum state-preserving normal conditional expectation. So as in [BMT88, Sec.6A], we have the explicit expression:

$$\phi_{\mathcal{B}_N}(B(f_1)\cdots B(f_n)) = \begin{cases} \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(B(f_1)\cdots B(f_n)) : \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_i = 0 \\ 0 \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\quad : \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_i \neq 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.13}$$

Consider now the tensor product net $\mathcal{A}_N := \mathcal{B}_N \otimes \mathcal{F}$, which is an extension of the supersymmetric free field net $\mathcal{A}$ from the preceding subsections and hence superconformal again (with central charge $c = 3/2$), with the obvious choice of grading $\gamma_N := \mathrm{id} \otimes \gamma$ and translation automorphisms $\alpha_t^N : B(f)F(g) \mapsto B(f(t + \cdot))F(f(t + \cdot))$; let $\mathfrak{A}_N$ denote the corresponding quasi-local C*-algebra and

$$\mathfrak{A}_{N,0} := \{B(f), F(g)(J(g) + \mathrm{i})^{-1} : f, g \in \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R}), \int_{\mathbb{R}} f \in \sqrt{2N}\mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Note that if $f = g'$ for some $g \in \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R})$, then $B(f) = W(g)$ (up to some phase factor), so δ_N can be defined as an extension of δ as follows: let $I_0 \in \mathcal{I}$ and $f_0, h_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_{\frac{1}{2}I_0}$ with $\int f_0 = \sqrt{2N}$ be arbitrary, and set $b := B(f_0)$. Every $x \in \mathfrak{A}_{N,0}$ can be written in the form $b^n y$ with unique $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $y \in \mathfrak{A}_0$. Thus we define:

$$\mathrm{dom}(\delta_N) := {}^*\text{-alg}\{b^n y : n \in \mathbb{Z}, y \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta)\}$$

(which clearly contains both $\mathrm{dom}(\delta)$ and $\mathfrak{A}_{N,0}$) and

$$\delta_N(b^n y) := -\sum_{k=1}^{n} b^{k-1} F(f_0) b^{n-k} y + b^n \delta(y), \tag{3.14}$$

which extends δ and can be shown to be welldefined and to verify all conditions (i)-(iv) of superderivations of $(\mathfrak{A}_N, \gamma_N, \alpha^N)$, for intervals $I \supset I_0$.

Let $\psi_N := \phi_{\mathcal{B}_N} \otimes \phi_{\mathcal{F}}$ on $\mathfrak{A}_N$ with $\mathrm{dom}(\psi_N) = \mathfrak{B}_N \odot \mathrm{dom}(\phi_{\mathcal{F}})$. Clearly, $\psi_N \restriction_{\mathrm{dom}(\psi)} = \psi$. Then, in view of (3.13) and (3.14) we find $\psi_N \delta_N(b^n y) = 0$ if $n \neq 0$, while $\psi_N \delta_N(y) = \psi\delta(y) = 0$ owing to the construction in Theorem 3.7, so $\psi_N \delta_N = 0$ on $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_N)$. The other properties of sKMS functionals are similarly straight-forward consequences of the sKMS properties for ψ, so ψ_N is in fact an sKMS functional on $\mathfrak{A}_N$.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{A}_N$ be the above superconformal BMT extension of the supersymmetric free field net and $(\mathfrak{A}_N, \gamma_N, \alpha^N, \delta_N)$ the corresponding graded quantum dynamical system. Then the functional $(\psi_N, \mathrm{dom}(\psi_N))$ is a nontrivial sKMS functional for $(\mathfrak{A}_N, \gamma_N, \alpha^N, \delta_N)$, which coincides with ψ in restriction to the free field subnet and verifies (S_4') and (S_6).*

In particular, $(\mathfrak{A}_N, \gamma_N, \alpha^N, \delta_N)$ has precisely one KMS state, but also the above unbounded sKMS functional for the superderivation $(\delta_N, \mathrm{dom}(\delta_N))$.

Under an analogous δ-regularity assumptions as in the free field case, one obtains even the uniqueness of ψ_N: since ψ extends in a unique manner to $\mathfrak{A}_N$ and since, in restriction to $\mathfrak{B}$, every KMS functional on $\mathfrak{B}_N$ still has to verify the KMS condition, it follows that ψ_N is the only possible sKMS functional on $\mathfrak{A}_N$, but we leave to the reader to make this formulation more precise since we do not need it henceforth. The second statement in the theorem is just a consequence of complete rationality of the net $\mathcal{A}_N$ and the already cited fact from [CLTW11a].

Examples through restriction

Given the d-fermionic free field $\mathcal{F}$ from above, one may consider arbitrary superconformal subnets $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$. Then one obtains a nontrivial unbounded functional for the quasi-local C*-algebra of the subnet simply by restricting $(\phi_\mathcal{F}, \mathrm{dom}(\phi_\mathcal{F}))$. It satisfies properties (S_0)-(S_3) and (S_6) by construction, in the same way as for the free fermion field.

However, if we want compatibility with respect to a superderivation δ on $\mathcal{G}$, note that δ has in general nothing to do with $\phi_\mathcal{F}$ but depends instead only on the subnet; hence, we cannot expect the compatibility conditions (S_4)-(S_5) to hold in this case. Consequently, the JLO cocycle construction in the following section need not be applicable to those subnets, either. A typical example of $\mathcal{G}$ consists in the supercurrent algebra nets, i.e., superconformal generalizations of current algebra nets associated to affine Lie algebras as studied algebraically in [KT85] and from the noncommutative geometry point of view of superconformal nets in [CHL12, Sec.6].

The most fundamental (ungraded) local conformal nets are the Virasoro nets $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{Vir},c}$ with certain central charges $c > 0$ because every conformal net contains a copy of one of them; their KMS states are discussed in [CLTW11b, Sec.5]. For $c < 1$, $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{Vir},c}$ is completely rational, and for the particular value $c = 1/2$, it coincides with the fixed point subnet $\mathcal{F}^\gamma$ of the d-fermion free field with $d = 1$.

Corollary 3.9. *Besides the unique (geometric) KMS state, the completely rational local conformal net $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{Vir},1/2}$ has a nontrivial nonpositive unbounded KMS functional.*

Proof. Let $d = 1$ and restrict the functional $\phi_\mathcal{F}$ in Theorem 3.3 to $\mathfrak{F}^\gamma = \mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{Vir},1/2}$. It is unbounded and nonpositive and satisfies $(S_0) - (S_3)$, as can be easily checked based on the preceding results. In restriction to even elements, the sKMS condition becomes the KMS condition. Since $\mathcal{F}^\gamma = \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{Vir},1/2}$ is completely rational, it has a unique KMS state ϕ_{geo} (cf. [CLTW11a]), but furthermore, as just seen, at least one nontrivial (locally bounded and normal) unbounded KMS functional $\phi_{\mathcal{F}|\mathfrak{F}^\gamma} \neq \phi_{\mathrm{geo}}$ with local domains $\mathrm{dom}(\phi_{\mathcal{F}|\mathfrak{F}^\gamma})_I = \mathrm{dom}(\phi_\mathcal{F})_I^\gamma = \mathcal{F}(I)^\gamma$. ☐

Super-Virasoro nets

Returning to superconformal nets, consider the supersymmetric free field $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ discussed above, with $d = 1$ here, and as always on the vacuum (Fock) space $\mathcal{H}$. By definition (in Section 2) of superconformal nets, it contains the super-Virasoro net $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c}$ with central charge $c = 3/2$ as diffeomorphism-covariant subnet, with super-Virasoro generators $L(f), G(f)$, for $f \in \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R})$, as introduced in (C.5) and (C.6) in Appendix C.2. The construction in [BSM90, (4.6)], [Car04, Sec.4] and [CLTW11b, p.793] inspired moreover to the following modification: for every $s \geq 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R})$, let

$$L_s(f) := L(f) + sJ(f') + \frac{s^2}{4\pi}\int_\mathbb{R} f, \quad G_s(f) := G(f) + 2sF(f'). \tag{3.15}$$

Since this example is not of our main interest, we skip the lengthy analytical details, and just keep on record that the new fields L_s, G_s satisfy again the super-Virasoro commutation relations (C.5), but now with central charge $c_s = 3/2 + 12s^2$. They give in fact rise to a the super-Virasoro net $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s}$. It has the same grading γ and translation action α as $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s}(I) \subset \mathcal{A}(I)$, for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$, but for $s \neq 0$ the dilation actions are different, whence $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s}$ is not a conformal subnet of $\mathcal{A}$ in the strict sense [Car04, p.277].

All $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s}(I)$ inherit the superderivation δ_{Q_I} (Lemma 3.4) from $\mathcal{A}(I)$ with dense domains $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_{Q_I}) \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s}(I) \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s}(I)$, which is shown in [CHKL10, Sec.5]. Although $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_{Q_I}) \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s}(I) \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s}(I)$ is σ-weakly dense, recalling (3.9) we cannot even say whether $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_I) \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s}(I)$ is nontrivial, i.e., larger than $\mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$. Since ψ_I is constructed w.r.t. δ_I and not δ_{Q_I}, we have to choose for $\delta_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s}$ the restriction of δ to the super-Virasoro net, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{dom}(\delta_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s}) = \bigcup_{I\in\mathcal{I}} \mathrm{dom}(\delta_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s})_I, \quad \mathrm{dom}(\delta_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s})_I = \mathrm{dom}(\delta_I) \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c_s}(I),$$

whence (S_4) continues to hold but the denseness properties in *(iii)*, *(iv)* and (S_4') might unfortunately fail for the present model. We expect this to be a very technical issue, which we have not been able to treat so far. Nevertheless, we can say

Theorem 3.10. *Let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c}$ be the super-Virasoro net, with $c \geq 3/2$. Then the corresponding restricted quantum dynamical system $(\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c}, \gamma, \alpha, \delta_{\mathrm{SVir},c})$ has at least one nontrivial sKMS functional, namely the restriction $\psi \restriction_{\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c} \cap \mathrm{dom}(\psi)}$ of the unique δ-regular sKMS functional ψ of the free field, satisfying (S_6) but not necessarily (S_4').*

Proof. Let ψ be the sKMS functional of the free field net $\mathcal{A}$ from Theorem 3.7. Owing to local normality and local boundedness of ψ, it restricts to a nontrivial locally normal and locally bounded functional on $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c}$. Since the translation action α and the superderivation $\delta_{\mathrm{SVir},c}$ are just restriction to that subnet, we have $\mathrm{im}(\delta_{\mathrm{SVir},c,I}) \subset \mathrm{dom}(\psi \restriction_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c}(I)})$; moreover, the supersymmetry relation, the sKMS property, local-exponential boundedness and normalization are also a trivial consequence of the restriction procedure. Since ψ is locally bounded, we see that $\mathrm{dom}(\psi \restriction_{\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c} \cap \mathrm{dom}(\psi)})$ contains the *-algebra generated by all local algebras $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c}(I) \subset \mathcal{A}(I)$, which in turn is norm-dense in the quasi-local C*-algebra $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c}$. $\square$

4 JLO cocycles and deformations of super-KMS functionals

Given an sKMS functional for a graded quantum dynamical system, Jaffe, Lesniewski and Wisniowski have found a natural way to associate an entire cyclic cocycle [JLW89], generalizing their famous construction of JLO cocycles for super-Gibbs functionals with supercharges [JLO88]. Unfortunately, [JLW89] works only for bounded sKMS functionals, which for the translation group under usual assumptions do not exist [BL00]. Buchholz and Grundling showed, however, that in a special model a certain local-exponential bound is satisfied, which permits to associate an entire cyclic cocycle again, although involving certain analytical difficulties [BG07]. Here we would like to generalize the latter result to sKMS functionals as in Definition 2.1 for the graded quantum dynamical systems $(\mathfrak{A}, \gamma, (\alpha_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}, \delta)$ of a graded-local conformal net $\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ with respect to the translation group action; moreover, we would like to show homotopy invariance of the cocycle as suggested in [JLW89]. Recall from the Introduction that this holds in fact for graded translation-covariant nets over more general spacetimes.

Given a normed algebra $(A, \|\cdot\|_*)$, we recall that the induced norm of an n-linear functional ρ_n on A is

$$\|\rho_n\|_* = \sup_{x_i\in A} \frac{|\rho_n(x_0, ..., x_n)|}{\|x_0\|_* \cdot ... \cdot \|x_n\|_*}.$$

The following adaptation of entireness to the locally bounded setting is taken from [BG07, Def.6.2].

Definition 4.1. A *local-entire cochain* on a *-subalgebra $A \subset \mathfrak{A}$ is given by a sequence $(\rho_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ of n-linear functionals on A with norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{1/2} \|\rho_n \restriction_{A\cap\mathcal{A}(I)} \|_*^{1/n} = 0, \quad I \in \mathcal{I}.$$

The even cochains are those with $\rho_{2n+1} = 0$ and the odd cochains those with $\rho_{2n} = 0$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. A local-entire cochain is a *local-entire cyclic cocycle* if $\partial\rho = 0$, where $\partial := B+b$ maps even into odd local-entire chains and v.v., and

$$b\rho_{n-1}(x_0,..,x_n) := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j \rho_{n-1}(x_0,...,x_j x_{j+1},...,x_n) + (-1)^n \rho_{n-1}(x_n x_0, x_1,...,x_{n-1})$$

$$B\rho_{n+1}(x_0,...,x_n) := \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^{nj} \rho_{n+1}(\mathbf{1}, x_j,...,x_{j-1}), \quad x_i \in A.$$

We consider for A the *-algebra $\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c^\gamma$ with the graph norm $\|\cdot\|_* := \|\cdot\| + \|\delta(\cdot)\|$. Given $t \in \mathbb{R}$, write

$$\Delta_n^t := \{s \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 \leq \mathrm{sgn}(t)s_1 \leq ... \leq \mathrm{sgn}(t)s_n \leq |t|\},$$

$\Delta_n := \Delta_n^1$ and the tube $\mathcal{T}^n := \{s \in \mathbb{C}^n : \Im(s) \in \Delta_n\}$ generalizing the strip $\mathcal{T}^1$. Then the first fact is

Proposition 4.2. *Given a local-exponentially bounded sKMS functional ϕ for the graded quantum dynamical system $(\mathfrak{A}, \gamma, (\alpha_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}, \delta)$, the expression*

$$\tau_n(x_0,...,x_n) := \mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{t\to\mathrm{i}} \int_{\Delta_n} \phi(x_0 \alpha_{s_1 t}(\delta(x_1))...\alpha_{s_n t}(\delta(x_n)))\, \mathrm{d}^n s, \quad x_i \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c^\gamma,$$

is well-defined and gives rise to an even local-entire cyclic cocycle $(\tau_n)_{n\in 2\mathbb{N}_0}$ on $\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c^\gamma$, called the JLO cocycle

For the proof of this proposition in Appendix C.3 and the other constructions of the present section, we shall need the following two statements that have been obtained in [BG07, p.742]:

- for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $x_i \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)_I$, the function

  $$s \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \phi\big(x_0 \alpha_{s_1}(x_1) \cdots \alpha_{s_n}(x_n)\big) \tag{4.1}$$

  extends to the tube $\mathcal{T}^n$ (with the extension performed recursively in the n variables as in [BG07]);

- there are constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $x_i \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)_I$ and $s \in \mathcal{T}^n$, we have

  $$|\phi(x_0 \alpha_{s_1}(x_1) \cdots \alpha_{s_n}(x_n))| \leq C_1\, \mathrm{e}^{2C_2(|I|+1)^2(n+1)}\, \mathrm{e}^{C_2(|I|+1)\sum_{k=1}^n s_k^2} \|x_0\| \cdots \|x_n\|, \tag{4.2}$$

  and for simplicity we will assume $C_1 = 1$ henceforth, which can always be achieved by rescaling C_2.

These two facts are crucial in establishing the well-definedness and local-entireness of τ.

Let us study the general situation of a perturbation of a given graded quantum dynamical system $(\mathfrak{A}, \gamma, (\alpha_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}, \delta)$ by an odd element $Q \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$. The ideas and proofs are partially adaptations of [JLW89] using results from [BG07]. Since they are lengthy and technical, we postpone them to Appendix C.3 and refer to [BG07] whenever possible.

Proposition 4.3. *For every* $I \in \mathcal{I}$ *and* $Q \in \operatorname{dom}(\delta^\infty)_I$ *and* $r \in [0,1]$, *let* $\delta_r := \delta + r \operatorname{ad}(Q)$ *and* $a_r := r\delta(Q) + r^2 Q^2 \in \operatorname{dom}(\delta^\infty)_I$. *Let* ϕ *be a local-exponentially bounded sKMS functional for* $(\mathfrak{A}, \gamma, (\alpha_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}, \delta)$. *Define formally*

$$\alpha_t^r(x) := \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \mathrm{i}^n \int_{\Delta_n^t} \operatorname{ad}(\alpha_{s_1}(a_r)) \cdots \operatorname{ad}(\alpha_{s_n}(a_r))(\alpha_t(x)) \, \mathrm{d}^n s,$$

and

$$\gamma_t^r(x) := \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \mathrm{i}^n \int_{\Delta_n^t} \alpha_{s_1}(a_r) \cdots \alpha_{s_n}(a_r) \alpha_t(x) \, \mathrm{d}^n s, \quad x \in \operatorname{dom}(\phi)_c, t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then each of the summands lies in $\operatorname{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$ *if* $x \in \operatorname{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$, *and* $(\alpha_t^r)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ *is a* ϕ-weak one-parameter group of automorphisms *in the following sense: the formal sum* $\phi(x\alpha_t^r(y)z)$ *converges, for every* $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $x, z \in \operatorname{dom}(\phi)_I$ *and* $y \in \operatorname{dom}(\delta^\infty)_I$, *it is continuous in* t, *and* $\phi(x\alpha_{t_1+t_2}^r(y)z)$ *equals* $\phi(x\alpha_{t_1}^r(\alpha_{t_2}^r(y))z)$, *for all* $t, t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$; *moreover,* α_t^r *commutes with* γ *and satisfies the following estimate:*

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\phi\Big(x(\alpha_t^r(y) - \alpha_t^s(y))z\Big)\Big| \\ &\quad \leq 4|s-r|(\|\delta(Q)\| + \|Q^2\|)|t| \, \mathrm{e}^{4C_2(1+|I|+t^2)^2} \, \mathrm{e}^{2(r+s)(\|\delta(Q)\|+\|Q^2\|)\, \mathrm{e}^{4C_2(1+|I|+t^2)^2}} \, \|x\|\|y\|\|z\|,\end{aligned}$$

with $M_r = 2\|a_r\| \, \mathrm{e}^{C|t+I|^p}$. *Analogously,* $(\gamma_t^r)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ *is a* ϕ*-weak one-parameter group of vector space homomorphisms in the following sense: the formal sum* $\phi(x\gamma_t^r(y)z)$ *converges, for every* $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $x, z \in \operatorname{dom}(\phi)_I$ *and* $y \in \operatorname{dom}(\delta^\infty)_I$, *it is continuous in* t, *and* $\phi(x\gamma_{t_1+t_2}^r(y)z)$ *equals* $\phi(x\gamma_{t_1}^r(\gamma_{t_2}^r(y))z)$, *for all* $t, t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$; *moreover,* γ_t^r *commutes with* γ *and satisfies the following estimate:*

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\phi\Big(x(\gamma_t^r(y) - \gamma_t^q(y))z\Big)\Big| \\ &\quad \leq 4|s-r|(\|\delta(Q)\| + \|Q^2\|)|t| \, \mathrm{e}^{4C_2(1+|I|+t^2)^2} \, \mathrm{e}^{2(r+s)(\|\delta(Q)\|+\|Q^2\|)\, \mathrm{e}^{4C_2(1+|I|+t^2)^2}} \, \|x\|\|y\|\|z\|.\end{aligned}$$

Definition 4.4. Given a graded quantum dynamical system $(\mathfrak{A}, \gamma, (\alpha_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}, \delta)$ and an odd element $Q \in \operatorname{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$, let

$$\delta_r := \delta + r \operatorname{ad}(Q), \quad r \in [0,1].$$

Then $(\mathfrak{A}, \gamma, (\alpha_t^r)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}, \delta_r)$, for every $r \in [0,1]$, is called a *perturbed graded quantum dynamical system.* If ϕ is an sKMS functional for the original system, then the corresponding *perturbed functional* is given by

$$\phi^r(x) := \phi\big(x\gamma_{\mathrm{i}}^r(\mathbf{1})\big) := \operatorname{anal.cont}_{t\to\mathrm{i}} \phi\big(x\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})\big), \quad x \in \operatorname{dom}(\phi^r)_c = \operatorname{dom}(\phi)_c.$$

Note first that $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})$ need not be analytic nor extendable to $\mathbb{C}$, but the above expression is just a sloppy notation for the analytic continuation of the composed function $t \mapsto \phi(x\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1}))$ as discussed in (4.1) and (4.2); we shall make repetitive use of this abbreviation. Second, for $r \neq 0$, α^r loses its geometric interpretation: in general,

$$\alpha_t^r(\mathcal{A}(I)) \not\subset \mathcal{A}(t+I), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, I \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Only for I sufficiently large and t small such that $Q \in \mathcal{A}(I_0)$ and $I_0 \subset I \cap (t+I)$, this inclusion may still hold (ϕ-weakly).

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose* ϕ *is a local-exponentially bounded sKMS functional for* $(\mathfrak{A}, \gamma, (\alpha_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}, \delta)$. *The perturbed functional* $(\phi^r, \operatorname{dom}(\phi^r))$ *is a well-defined sKMS functional with respect to the perturbed system* $(\mathfrak{A}, \gamma, (\alpha_t^r)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}, \delta_r)$, *but in general neither local-exponentially bounded nor locally normal.*

We are now ready for the main result of this section:

Theorem 4.6. *Given a local-exponentially bounded sKMS functional* ϕ *on* $(\mathfrak{A},\gamma,(\alpha_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}},\delta)$, *the even JLO cochain* τ *over* $\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c^\gamma$ *is a local-entire cyclic cocycle. Moreover, it is homotopy-invariant: given an odd* $Q\in\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$, *the perturbed functionals* ϕ^r *give rise to JLO cocycles* τ^r *again, which are cohomologous, for all* $r\in[0,1]$.

Example 4.7. *Free field net and its rational extensions.* The supersymmetric free field and an associated sKMS functional and JLO cocycle have been extensively studied in Section 3, in particular in Theorem 3.3, and we refer to the notation introduced there. One can define the JLO local-entire cyclic cocycle τ on $\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c^\gamma$. While in [BG07, Sec.6] we find a JLO cocycle in the *-algebraic context for an algebra on which δ is not (σ-weak)-(σ-weakly) closed, we adapted the construction there to the structurally more suitable algebra $\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)^\gamma$, in particular in view of Example 4.8.

The JLO cocycle is nontrivial because

$$\tau(\mathbf{1})=\tau_0(\mathbf{1})=\phi(\mathbf{1})=1,$$

owing to the normalization condition (S_3) on ϕ.

An example of an admissible perturbation which leaves the class of τ invariant is given by

$$Q=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\alpha_t\left((J(f)-\mathrm{i})^{-1}F(f)(J(f)+\mathrm{i})^{-1}\right)h(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,t,$$

with arbitrary but fixed $f,h\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_c$. This perturbation is selfadjoint, odd, localized and smooth, i.e., $Q\in\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$. The last two statements follow from Proposition 3.6.

It seems interesting to study explicit (co-)homology classes and understand their physical meaning. However, the computations seem very tedious and are left for future investigation. The conceptually interesting elements investigated in [CHL12, Sec.5] or [CCHW12, Sec.4] are unfortunately global, hence not in $\mathfrak{A}$, and not applicable here.

Obviously, we may replace the free field net by its rational extension as discussed in Theorem 3.8, and all the above results concerning the JLO cocycle and perturbations extend to that setting.

Example 4.8. *Super-Virasoro net.* Since the super-Virasoro net with central charge $c\geq 3/2$ is a subnet of the free field net, this example becomes a consequence of the preceding one by restriction to $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{SVir}}\cap\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$. Note that also the perturbed cocycle defined by the perturbation Q in the preceding example restricts to a local-entire cyclic cocycle on $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{SVir}}\cap\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$, which is cohomologous to τ_{SVir}. Whether τ_{SVir} is really meaningful and whether there are possible perturbations *in* $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{SVir}}\cap\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$ depends on whether $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir}}(I)\cap\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c\subset\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir}}(I)$ is actually bigger than $\mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$. We expect this to be true, but a proof is missing so far.

Appendix

A A generalization of Araki's criterion on quasi-equivalence

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a complex Hilbert space with selfadjoint involution Γ and use the notation for quasi-free states as at the beginning of Section 3. Write $L^1(\mathcal{K})\subset B(\mathcal{K})$ for the ideal of trace-class operators on $\mathcal{K}$.

Theorem A.1 (Araki [Ara70]). *Given two selfadjoint operators* $R,S\in B(\mathcal{K})$ *such that* $0\leq R\leq\mathbf{1},0\leq S\leq\mathbf{1}$ *and* $R+\Gamma R\Gamma=S+\Gamma S\Gamma=\mathbf{1}$, *assume that*

$$(S^{1/2}-R^{1/2})^2\in L^1(\mathcal{K}).$$

Then the GNS representations π_{ϕ_R} and π_{ϕ_S} of the two quasi-free states ϕ_R and ϕ_S are quasi-equivalent.

Recall the following useful reformulation of [KR86, Prop.10.3.13]:

Lemma A.2. *Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a C^*-algebra. If ϕ, ψ are two states on $\mathfrak{A}$ such that π_ϕ and π_ψ are quasi-equivalent, then ψ is normal in the GNS representation π_ϕ, and vice versa. More precisely, there exists a normal state $\tilde{\psi}$ of $\pi_\phi(\mathfrak{A})''$ such that $\psi = \tilde{\psi} \circ \pi_\phi$.*

The last part of this lemma makes also sense when ψ is no longer a state. We may then ask whether it is also possible to adapt Theorem A.1 to the case when ϕ_S is no longer a state. In a weak version this is in fact possible:

Theorem A.3. *Given two selfadjoint operators $R, S \in B(\mathcal{K})$ such that $0 \leq R \leq \mathbf{1}$ and $R + \Gamma R \Gamma = S + \Gamma S \Gamma = \mathbf{1}$, assume that*

$$(S - R) \in L^1(\mathcal{K}).$$

Then the quasi-free functional ϕ_S on $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}, \Gamma)$ *is bounded and normal in the GNS representation of the quasi-free state ϕ_R.*

We shall use and prove Theorem A.3 in the following equivalent formulation:

Theorem A.4. *Given two selfadjoint operators $T \in L^1(\mathcal{K})$ and $R \in B(\mathcal{K})$ such that*

$$T + \Gamma T \Gamma = 0, \quad R + \Gamma R \Gamma = \mathbf{1}, \quad 0 \leq R \leq \mathbf{1}.$$

Then the quasi-free functional ϕ_{R+T} on $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}, \Gamma)$ *is bounded and normal in the GNS representation of the quasi-free state ϕ_R.*

Proof. (1) *Decomposition of $\mathcal{K}$.* Let $S := R + T \in B(\mathcal{K})$; it is selfadjoint and thus gives rise to a decomposition of $\mathcal{K}$ into spectral subspaces: letting

$$P_0 := \chi_{(-\infty,0)}(S), \quad P_1 := \chi_{[0,1]}(S), \quad P_2 := \chi_{(1,\infty)}(S),$$

the projections P_i are mutually orthogonal and $P_0 + P_1 + P_2 = \mathbf{1}$. We set $\mathcal{K}_i := P_i \mathcal{K}$, so $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_0 \oplus \mathcal{K}_1 \oplus \mathcal{K}_2$ and split S accordingly into the sum of

$$S_0 := SP_0 \leq 0, \quad 0 \leq S_1 := SP_1 \leq P_1, \quad P_2 < S_2 := SP_2.$$

The operator $\tilde{S} := \Gamma S \Gamma = \mathbf{1} - S$ has the same spectrum as S and gives therefore rise again to spectral projections $\tilde{P}_i = \Gamma P_i \Gamma$. We find

$$\Gamma P_0 \Gamma = \chi_{(-\infty,0)}(\Gamma S \Gamma) = \chi_{(-\infty,0)}(\mathbf{1} - S) = \chi_{(1,\infty)}(S) = P_2$$

and analogously $\Gamma P_1 \Gamma = P_1$, so $\Gamma \mathcal{K}_0 = \mathcal{K}_2$ and $\Gamma \mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{K}_1$. Moreover,

$$\tilde{S}_2 + S_0 = P_0, \quad \tilde{S}_1 + S_1 = P_1, \quad \tilde{S}_0 + S_2 = P_2.$$

We set

$$X := S_1 + P_2, \quad Y := S_0 + S_2 - P_2 = S - (S_1 + P_2)$$

and note that they are selfadjoint, $0 \leq X \leq \mathbf{1}$, $\Gamma X \Gamma = \mathbf{1} - X$ and $\Gamma Y \Gamma = -Y$. X may be regarded as a "truncation of S between 0 and 1".

(2) *Claim: we have*

$$X - R \in L^1(\mathcal{K}) \quad \text{and} \quad Y \in L^1(\mathcal{K}). \tag{A.1}$$

Since $X - R - T = -Y$ and $T \in L^1(\mathcal{K})$, it suffices to show $Y \in L^1(\mathcal{K})$. Moreover, since $\Gamma S_0 \Gamma = P_2 - S_2$, it suffices to show $S_0 \in L^1(\mathcal{K})$. We have

$$0 \geq P_0(R+T)P_0 = P_0RP_0 + P_0TP_0,$$

where the first term on the RHS is positive and the second one therefore negative; in other words

$$0 \leq P_0RP_0 \leq -P_0TP_0 \in L^1(\mathcal{K}),$$

so P_0RP_0 being dominated by a trace-class element is trace-class, too, and so is $S_0 = P_0RP_0 + P_0TP_0$.

Since S_0 and $S_2 - P_2$ are selfadjoint and trace-class, they can be assumed to be diagonal, and thus also S_2. Write S_0' for the diagonal operator which coincides with S_0 on the subspaces of spectrum $\subset [-1/2, 0]$ and equals $(-1/2)\mathbf{1}$ on the (finite-dimensional) orthogonal complement. Analogously define $S_2' - P_2$ and $Y' := S_0' + S_2' - P_2$, which has spectrum in $[-1/2, 1/2]$. Clearly they are again trace-class and $X - Y'$ gives rise to a quasi-free state on $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}, \Gamma)$.

(3) *Claim:*

$$\phi_{X-Y'} \simeq \phi_X \simeq \phi_R. \tag{A.2}$$

In particular, $\phi_{X-Y'}$ is a state and normal with respect to the representation defined by ϕ_R according to Lemma A.2. In order to show the quasi-equivalence of the quasi-free states, we just have to check Araki's criterion in the present case. We have

$$\|(X - Y')^{1/2} - X^{1/2}\|_2^2 \leq \|(X - Y') - X\|_1 = \|Y'\|_1 < \infty,$$

using (2) in the last step and the Powers-Størmer inequality in the first step, which says

$$\|x^{1/2} - y^{1/2}\|_2^2 \leq \|x - y\|_1,$$

for all $x, y \in B(\mathcal{K})_+$, [PS70, Lem.4.1]. A similar reasoning shows $\phi_X \simeq \phi_R$.

(4) *Eigenspaces of Y.* Write $P_{02} := P_0 + P_2$ and consider the orthonormal basis $(e_j)_{j\in J}$ of $P_2\mathcal{K}$ of eigenvectors of $S_2 - P_2$, with eigenvalues $\lambda_j > 0$. Then $(e_j, \Gamma e_j)_{j\in J}$ forms an orthonormal basis for $P_{02}\mathcal{K}$ of eigenvectors of Y with eigenvalues $\pm\lambda_j$, respectively. Clearly they are also eigenvectors of the truncation Y'. We remark that P_0 and P_2 are basis projections on $P_{02}\mathcal{K}$ in the sense of [Ara70, Sec.2].

(5) *Reduction to subalgebras.* We have to show that ϕ_{X+Y} is bounded and that it is normal in π_{ϕ_R} or, equivalently according to (3), in $\pi_{\phi_{X-Y'}}$. To this end, it suffices to show that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$|\phi_{X+Y}(x)| \leq c \cdot \phi_{X-Y'}(x), \quad x \in \mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}, \Gamma)_+.$$

Notice that the *-algebra

$$B := {}^*\text{-alg}\{F(f) : f \in \{e_j, \Gamma e_j : j \in J\} \cup \mathcal{K}_1\}$$

is dense in $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}, \Gamma)$, so $B_+ \subset \mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}, \Gamma)_+$ is dense, and it suffices to show

$$|\phi_{X+Y}(b)| \leq c \cdot \phi_{X-Y'}(b), \quad b \in B_+. \tag{A.3}$$

We define the *-subalgebra

$$A := {}^*\text{-alg}\{F(e_j)^* F(e_j), F(f) : j \in J, f \in \mathcal{K}_1\}.$$

From the canonical anticommutation relations one deduces that A is isomorphic to the algebraic tensor product

$$\Big(\bigodot_{j\in\mathbb{N}} {}^*\text{-alg}\{F(e_j)^*F(e_j)\}\Big) \odot \Big({}^*\text{-alg}\{F(f) : f \in \mathcal{K}_1\}\Big) \simeq (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\odot\mathbb{N}} \odot {}^*\text{-alg}\{F(f) : f \in \mathcal{K}_1\},$$

while B as a vector space is isomorphic to the tensor product of all *-alg$\{F(e_j)\} \simeq \mathrm{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$ and *-alg$\{F(f) : f \in \mathcal{K}_1\}$, and $\phi_{X+Y} \restriction_B$ and $\phi_{X-Y'} \restriction_B$ split as product functionals according to this tensor product decomposition of B.

We would like to construct a projection from B onto the subspace $A \subset B$ compatible with this factorization. Fix the orthogonal projections $p_{j,0} := F(e_j)^*F(e_j)$ and $p_{j,1} := F(e_j)F(e_j)^* = \mathbf{1} - p_{j,0}$ in *-alg$\{F(e_j)^*F(e_j)\}$. Given any $b \in B$, we can always write it as a finite sum of elements of the form $b_1b_2\cdots b_nb'$ owing to the tensor product property, with some finite n and with $b_j \in {}^*$-alg$\{F(e_j)\}$ and $b' \in {}^*$-alg$\{F(f) : f \in \mathcal{K}_1\}$. Then we define

$$\eta(b_1b_2\cdots b_nb') := \sum_{k\in\{0,1\}^n} p_{1,k_1}\cdots p_{n,k_n}(b_1b_2\cdots b_nb')p^*_{n,k_n}\cdots p^*_{1,k_1}.$$

It is obvious from this definition that η extends to a completely positive map on B, that all $p_{j,k}$ commute,

$$\eta(b_1b_2b_3\cdots b') = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(p_{j,0}b_jp_{j,0} + p_{j,1}b_jp_{j,1}) \cdot b' = \eta(b_1)\eta(b_2)\eta(b_3)\cdots\eta(b'),$$

so η factorizes according to the tensor product decomposition, and on every single component it is a projection, thus $\eta^2 = \eta$ on all of B with $\eta(B) = A$. Now, letting for a moment ϕ stand for either of the two $\phi_{X+Y} \restriction_B$ or $\phi_{X-Y'} \restriction_B$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi\big(\eta\big(\lambda_1F(e_j)^*F(e_j) + \lambda_2F(e_j) + \lambda_3F(e_j)^* + \lambda_4F(e_j)F(e_j)^*\big)\big)\\ =&\phi\big(\lambda_1F(e_j)^*F(e_j) + \lambda_4F(e_j)F(e_j)^*\big)\\ =&\phi\big(\lambda_1F(e_j)^*F(e_j) + \lambda_2F(e_j) + \lambda_3F(e_j)^* + \lambda_4F(e_j)F(e_j)^*\big),\end{aligned}$$

for all $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and, since ϕ splits as a tensor product functional,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi\eta(b_1b_2\cdots b') =&\phi(\eta(b_1)\eta(b_2)\cdots\eta(b')) = \phi\eta(b_1)\phi\eta(b_2)\cdots\phi\eta(b')\\ =&\phi(b_1)\phi(b_2)\cdots\phi(b') = \phi(b_1b_2\cdots b').\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\phi\eta = \phi$ and we can write $b = \eta(b)+k$ with $k := b-\eta(b) \in \ker(\phi)$; in fact, we have $b - \eta(b) \in \ker(\phi_{X+Y}) \cap \ker(\phi_{X-Y'})$. Now since $\phi_{X+Y} \circ \eta = \phi_{X+Y}$ and $\phi_{X-Y'} \circ \eta = \phi_{X-Y'}$ on B and η is positive, it suffices to check boundedness and (A.3) for $x \in A_+$.

Finally, write $A = A_{02} \odot A_1$, with $A_{02} := {}^*$-alg$\{F(e_j)^*F(e_j) : j \in J\}$, so

$$\phi_{X+Y} \restriction_A = \phi_{P_{02}(X+Y)} \restriction_{A_{02}} \otimes \phi_{P_1(X+Y)} \restriction_{A_1}, \quad \phi_{X-Y'} \restriction_A = \phi_{P_{02}(X-Y')} \restriction_{A_{02}} \otimes \phi_{P_1(X-Y')} \restriction_{A_1} .$$

Since $P_1(X+Y) = P_1(X-Y')$, which gives rise to a state, $\phi_{X+Y} \restriction_A$ and $\phi_{X-Y'} \restriction_A$ coincide on the second factor A_1. Thus we just have to check that $\phi_{P_{02}(X+Y)} \restriction_{A_{02}}$ is bounded and satisfies (A.3) for $b \in A_{02,+}$.

(6) *Claim: there is a constant* $c > 0$ *such that*

$$|\phi_{P_{02}(X+Y)}(a)| \leq c|\phi_{P_{02}(X-Y')}(a)|, \quad a \in A_{02,+}. \tag{A.4}$$

We prove this on monomials of the form

$$a = p_{k_1,0}\cdots p_{k_n,0}p_{k_{n+1},1}\cdots p_{k_{n+m},1},$$

which implies that it holds for arbitrary elements in $A_{02,+}$, which can always be written as linear combinations of such monomials with positive coefficients due to commutativity of A_{02}.

Let $J_2(a) = \{k_1, ..., k_n\}$ and $J_0(a) = \{k_{n+1}, ..., k_{n+m}\}$ be the set of indices j occurring in the product expansion of a and note that they are disjoint; let $J'_{0,2}(a) \subset J_{0,2}(a)$ be the subset of those j with $0 < \lambda_j < 1/2$. Moreover, independently of a, define the constants $c_+ := \prod_{j\in J:\lambda_j \geq 1/2}(1+\lambda_j)^2$ and $c_- := \prod_{j\in J:\lambda_j\geq 1/2} 2^2$, which are finite since the products contain only finitely many factors (owing to the trace-class condition on Y). With these premises, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_{X+Y}(a)| =& \Big| \prod_{j\in J_0(a)} (-\lambda_j) \cdot \prod_{j\in J_2(a)} (1+\lambda_j) \Big| \leq c_+ \Big| \prod_{j\in J'_0(a)} (-\lambda_j) \Big| \cdot \prod_{j\in J'_2(a)} (1+\lambda_j) \\ \leq & c_+ \prod_{j\in J'_0(a)} \lambda_j \cdot \mathrm{e}^{2\,\mathrm{tr}(|Y|)} \prod_{j\in J'_2(a)} (1-\lambda_j) \leq \mathrm{e}^{2\,\mathrm{tr}(|Y|)}\, c_+ c_- \phi_{X-Y'}(a). \end{aligned}$$

The one but last inequality is true because $(1+\lambda) \leq \mathrm{e}^{4\lambda}(1-\lambda)$, for all $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1/2$, and $2\sum_{j\in J} \lambda_j = \mathrm{tr}(|Y|) < \infty$. Setting $c := \mathrm{e}^{2\,\mathrm{tr}(|Y|)}\, c_+ c_-$, claim (6) is proved.

(7) *Conclusion.* According to (3), $\phi_{X-Y'}$ and ϕ_R are relatively normal. On the other hand, (5) and (6) show that ϕ_{X+Y} is normal with respect to $c\phi_{X-Y'}$ and bounded by the latter on B_+, so that it extends to a bounded functional on $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}, \Gamma)$ which is normal with respect to $\phi_{X-Y'}$. Thus $\phi_S = \phi_{X+Y}$ is normal in the GNS representation of ϕ_R. □

B Super-KMS functionals for graded-local conformal nets over S^1

Let $\mathcal{B}_S$ be a local conformal net over S^1 (cf. e.g. [FG93]) and $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{B}_S)$ its locally normal universal C*-algebra [CCHW12, Sec.3]. We write $\iota_I : \mathcal{B}_S(I) \to C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{B}_S)$ for the natural inclusions, but often drop them when no confusion is likely. A natural symmetry group here is the rotation group $\mathbb{T}$, whose generator is the conformal Hamiltonian L_0. Its action by *-automorphisms, however, is periodic and not ergodic, so on the one hand we cannot expect any clustering property, on the other hand Proposition 2.3 does not apply in this setting whence bounded sKMS functionals in the graded-local case may become possible. It is known that in a given irreducible locally normal representation π in this setting, $\mathrm{e}^{-L_0^\pi}$ is trace-class, and any KMS state on $\pi(C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{B}_S)) \simeq B(\mathcal{H})$ has to be the Gibbs state $\mathrm{tr}_\pi(\cdot\, \mathrm{e}^{-L_0^\pi})$ (up to normalization), cf. [Haa92, Sec.V.1] together with [CCHW12, Th.2.11].

In the case of a graded-local net $\mathcal{A}_S$ over S^1, we have a similar result, with a similar but more involved argument, which we would like to sketch. The representation structure of $\mathcal{A}_S$ in relation to $\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma$ has been determined in [CKL08, Sec.4.3] from where we are going to recall a few facts now. $\mathcal{A}_S$ has Neveu-Schwarz and Ramond general representations, which are actually all proper representations of the 2-covering $\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}$. Thus instead of $C^*(\mathcal{A}_S)$ we have to choose $C^*(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})$ as the universal C*-algebra, which is defined in an analogous way as $C^*(\mathcal{B}_S)$ by means of its universal property for representations of $\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}$. We continue to use the same symbol for representations of $\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}$ and of $C^*(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})$. Restricting an irreducible representation π of $\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}$ to $\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma$, we obtain either a direct sum of two inequivalent irreducible representations ρ and $\rho\hat{\gamma}$ of $\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma$, with $\hat{\gamma}$ the dual of the grading (cf. [CKL08, Sec.2.5] or [CHL12, Sec.2]), or one irreducible representation $\rho \simeq \rho\hat{\gamma}$, depending on whether π

was graded or ungraded, respectively. V.v., extending an irreducible representation of $\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma$ to $\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}$ by α-induction, it is either irreducible or the direct sum of two ungraded representations which restrict to the same representation of $\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma$. One then realizes that if $\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}$ has m_1 graded and m_2 ungraded irreducible representation classes, then $\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma$ has $n = 2m_1 + \frac{1}{2}m_2$ classes of irreducible representations. We denote the m_1 classes of irreducible graded representations of $\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}$ by Δ_γ. Neveu-Schwarz representations are always graded while Ramond representations may be graded or ungraded.

We define the universal locally normal representation π_{ln} of $C^*(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})$ as the direct sum of GNS representations (over all states of $C^*(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})$) which are locally normal. It is quasi-equivalent to the direct sum of irreducible GNS representations with only one representative for each equivalence class. This latter sum is finite iff $m = m_1 + m_2$ is finite iff $n = 2m_1 + \frac{1}{2}m_2$. If $\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma$ is completely rational, then m_1, m_2, m are therefore finite. Writing $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}) = \pi_{\mathrm{ln}}(C^*(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}))$, we have in fact the following modification of [CCHW12, Th.3.3(3)]:

Proposition B.1. *Let $\mathcal{A}_S$ be a graded-local conformal net with $\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma$ completely rational. Then $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})$ is weakly closed and hence $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}) \simeq B(\mathcal{H})^{\oplus m}$, with m the number of equivalence classes of irreducible locally normal representations of $\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}$.*

Proof. Let π be a locally normal irreducible representation of $\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}$, so $\mathcal{H}_\pi \simeq \mathcal{H}$. If it is ungraded, then $\rho = \pi \restriction_{\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma}$ on $\mathcal{H}_\rho = \mathcal{H}_\pi$ is irreducible again and

$$B(\mathcal{H}_\pi) = B(\mathcal{H}_\rho) = \pi(C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma)) \subset \pi(C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})) \subset B(\mathcal{H}_\pi),$$

the equality being proved in [CCHW12, Th.3.3(3)], so $\pi(C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})) = B(\mathcal{H}_\pi)$. If π instead is graded, then $\pi_{|\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma}$ decomposes into the direct sum $\rho \oplus \rho\hat{\gamma}$ of two irreducible representations, so

$$B(\mathcal{H}_\rho) \oplus B(\mathcal{H}_{\rho\hat{\gamma}}) = \pi(C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma)) \subset \pi(C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})) \subset B(\mathcal{H}_\pi).$$

Furthermore, given $I \in \mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}(I)$ is generated by $\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma(I)$ and any *odd* selfadjoint unitary $v \in \mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}(I)$ (cf. [CKL08, Sec.2.6]), so

$$\pi(v) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v_1 \\ v_1^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in B(\mathcal{H}_\pi)$$

with some unitary v_1. Since $\pi(v)$ and $B(\mathcal{H}_\rho) \oplus B(\mathcal{H}_{\rho\hat{\gamma}})$ together generate $B(\mathcal{H}_\pi) = B(\mathcal{H}_\rho \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\rho\hat{\gamma}})$, we find $B(\mathcal{H}_\pi) \subset \pi(C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}))$.

The universal locally normal representation of $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})$ is quasi-equivalent to the direct sum of the m_1 graded and m_2 ungraded irreducible representations, so $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}) \simeq B(\mathcal{H})^{\oplus(m_1+m_2)}$. □

We would now like to study *bounded sKMS functionals* on $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})$ with respect to the rotation group action α, i.e., locally normal bounded selfadjoint functionals on $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})$ satisfying properties (S_3) and (S_2) (or equivalently (S_2')) with α the canonical rotation action on $\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}$, *dispensing with (S_4) and (S_5) for the moment.* For the proof we shall need

Lemma B.2. *Let $\mathcal{B}_S$ be a local conformal net and ψ a locally normal faithful KMS state on $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{B}_S)$ w.r.t. rotations α. Then for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$, the GNS representation of $\psi \restriction_{\mathcal{B}_S(I)}$ on $\mathcal{H}_{\psi_I}$ coincides with the GNS representation of ψ on $\mathcal{H}_\psi$ restricted to $\mathcal{B}_S(I)$.*

Proof. Fix $I \in \mathcal{I}$. The GNS representation of $\psi \restriction_{\mathcal{B}_S(I)}$ on $\mathcal{H}_{\psi_I}$ is clearly a subrepresentation of the GNS representation of ψ on $\mathcal{H}_\psi$ restricted to $\mathcal{B}_S(I)$. We show that they actually coincide.

To this end, let $\xi_{\psi_I} \in \mathcal{H}_{\psi_I} \subset \mathcal{H}_\psi$ be the cyclic vector for $\psi \restriction_{\mathcal{B}_S(I)}$, which coincides with the cyclic vector ξ_ψ of $(C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{B}_S), \psi)$. Suppose now there is $\eta \in \mathcal{H}_\psi$ orthogonal to $\overline{\mathcal{B}_S(I)\xi_\psi} = \mathcal{H}_{\psi_I} \subset \mathcal{H}_\psi$. Then there is $y \in C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{B}_S)$ such that $\eta = y\xi_\psi$; and, for all $I_0 \subset I$ and $x \in \mathcal{B}_S(I_0)$ and $s \in (-\pi, \pi)$ such that $s + I_0 \subset I$, we have

$$0 = \langle \eta, \alpha_s(x)\xi_\psi \rangle = \langle \xi_\psi, y^*\alpha_s(x)\xi_\psi \rangle = \psi(y^*\alpha_s(x)).$$

Owing to the KMS property of ψ, this is the boundary value of an analytical function on the strip $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : 0 < \Im z < 1\}$. It follows that $s \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \psi(y^*\alpha_s(x))$ has to be identically 0, so η is orthogonal to $\overline{\mathcal{B}_S(I_0 + s)\xi_\psi}$, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus the projection p onto this space has to lie in $\bigcap_{s\in\mathbb{R}} \iota_{I_0+s}(\mathcal{B}_S(I_0 + s))' = \mathcal{Z}(C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{B}_S))$; upon taking the quotient by $\ker \psi$ we may assume that ψ is faithful on $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{B}_S)$, so ξ_ψ separating for $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{B}_S)$ and thus for $C^*\{\iota_{I_0+s}(\mathcal{B}_S(I_0 + s)) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Consequently, p has to be $\mathbf{1}$. Therefore, $\eta = 0$, so $\mathcal{H}_{\psi_I} = \mathcal{H}_\psi$ and our claim is proved. □

Proposition B.3. *Let $\mathcal{A}_S$ be a graded-local conformal net over S^1 such that $\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma$ is completely rational. Then every bounded sKMS functional on $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})$ with respect to the rotation group is a linear combination of the* super-Gibbs functionals $\mathrm{tr}(\Gamma_\pi \pi(\cdot)\,\mathrm{e}^{-L_0^\pi})$, *with $[\pi] \in \Delta_\gamma$ and $\Gamma_\pi \in \pi(C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}))$ the grading unitary of π.*

Proof. Since ϕ is locally normal by assumption, so is $|\phi|$, and the latter is in fact normal owing to the preceding lemma. This in turn implies the normality of $\phi = |\phi|(w\cdot)$, with a certain isometry $w \in C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{B}_S)''$.

The nontrivial gradedness of ϕ implies that it vanishes on all components in the sum $C^*_{\mathrm{ln}}(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}) = B(\mathcal{H})^{\oplus m}$ corresponding to ungraded representations of $\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)}$. Let ϕ_i denote the restriction to the i-th graded component $\pi_i(C^*(\mathcal{A}_S^{(2)})) \simeq B(\mathcal{H}_{\pi_i})$ with $\mathcal{H}_{\pi_i} \simeq \mathcal{H}$ as always. Then ϕ_i has to be of the form $|\phi|(v_i\cdot)$, with v_i a partial isometry in $B(\mathcal{H})$. Furthermore, $|\phi_i|$ restricted to the even subalgebra

$$\pi_i(C^*(\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma)) = (\rho \oplus \rho\hat{\gamma})(C^*(\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma)) = \rho(C^*(\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma)) \oplus \rho\hat{\gamma}(C^*(\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma)) \simeq B(\mathcal{H}_\rho) \oplus B(\mathcal{H}_{\rho\hat{\gamma}})$$

is a bounded normal positive KMS functional [BL00, Lem.2]. Thus it has to be in fact a multiple of the Gibbs state associated to $\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2$, cf. [Haa92, Sec.V.1]. (The second and third equivalence in the above expression are shown in [CCHW12, Sec.2], and $\rho_1, \rho_2 = \rho_1\hat{\gamma}$ are the irreducible representations obtained by restricting the graded irreducible π_i.) This implies $a_i = \lambda_i\,\mathrm{e}^{-L_0^{\pi_i}} > 0$, with λ_i a positive real number. (Dropping the faithfulness assumption on $|\phi_i|$ on $B(\mathcal{H}_\pi)$, we may also allow $a_i = 0$.)

It remains to determine v_i. Letting Γ_{π_i} denote the grading unitary in the representation π_i (which commutes with $\mathrm{e}^{-L_0^{\pi_i}}$), the sKMS condition on ϕ_i implies

$$\mathrm{tr}(v_i x y\,\mathrm{e}^{-L_0^{\pi_i}}) = \mathrm{tr}(v_i \Gamma_{\pi_i} y \Gamma_{\pi_i}\,\mathrm{e}^{-L_0^{\pi_i}}\,x) = \mathrm{tr}(\Gamma_{\pi_i} x v_i \Gamma_{\pi_i} y\,\mathrm{e}^{-L_0^{\pi_i}}), \quad x, y \in B(\mathcal{H}),$$

so $\Gamma_{\pi_i} v_i x \Gamma_{\pi_i} = x v_i$. Choosing e.g. the standard system of matrix units in $B(\mathcal{H})$, we find $v_i = \pm\Gamma_{\pi_i}$. We conclude:

$$\phi = \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} \mu_i\,\mathrm{tr}(\Gamma_{\pi_i}\pi_i(\cdot)\,\mathrm{e}^{-L_0^{\pi_i}}),$$

with certain $\mu_i = \pm\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\phi(\mathbf{1}) = 1$: a linear combination of super-Gibbs functionals. The normalization is possible since all $\phi_i(\mathbf{1})$ are finite, and nonzero at least when π_i is the vacuum representation. $\square$

From the proof we obtain

Corollary B.4. *The space of bounded sKMS functionals with respect to rotations of a graded-local net $\mathcal{A}_S$ with $\mathcal{A}_S^\gamma$ completely rational forms a hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^{m_1}$.*

We finally remark that for those sKMS functionals coming from Ramond representations, there is a canonical superderivation (namely the one implemented by the operator G_0^λ in [CHKL10, Sec.4]) verifying in fact properties (S_4) and (S_5).

C Some technical proofs

In the following proofs, we keep the notation used in the corresponding theorems and sections.

C.1 Proofs for Section 2

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Suppose ϕ satisfies (S_2). Given $x, y \in \mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi}$, define

$$H_{x,y}(t) := \phi(x\alpha_t(y)) - F_{x,y}(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{T}^1.$$

Then $H_{x,y}$ is continuous on $\mathcal{T}^1$, analytic on the interior of $\mathcal{T}^1$, and 0 on $\mathbb{R}$, so $H_{x,y} = 0$ owing to the edge-of-the-wedge theorem [BR97, Prop.5.3.6]. This implies in particular

$$\phi(x\alpha_{\mathrm{i}}(y)) = F_{x,y}(\mathrm{i}) = \phi(y\gamma(x))$$

and $|\phi(x\alpha_t(y))| = |F_{x,y}(t)| \leq C_0(1 + |\Re(t)|)^{p_0}, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}^1$.

Vice versa, suppose ϕ satisfies (S_2') and (S_6). Given $x, y \in \mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi} \cap \mathcal{A}(I)$, define

$$G_{x,y}(t) := \mathrm{e}^{-2C_2(1+|I|)t^2}\, \phi(x\alpha_t(y)), \quad t \in \mathcal{T}^1.$$

It is continuous and bounded on $\mathcal{T}^1$ owing to the exponential damping factor and the growth condition in (S_2'), and it is analytic on the interior of $\mathcal{T}^1$. Thus

$$F_{x,y}(t) := \phi(x\alpha_t(y)), \quad t \in \mathcal{T}^1,$$

satisfies the conditions in (S_2). Consequently, also (S_7) and (S_8) hold on $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi} \cap \mathcal{A}(I)$ so far.

Given now arbitrary $x, y \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)_I = \mathcal{A}(I)$ with $\|x\| = \|y\| = 1$, choose sequences $x_n, y_n \in \mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi} \cap \mathcal{A}(I)$ such that

$$\|x_n\|, \|y_n\| \leq 1, \quad x_n \to x, \quad y_n \to y \quad (\sigma^*\text{-strongly}), \quad n \to \infty, \tag{C.1}$$

which is possible due to Kaplansky's density theorem if $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi} \cap \mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{A}(I)$ is σ-weakly dense. According to Phragmen-Lindelöf's three-line theorem, all $|G_{x_n,y_n} - G_{x_m,y_m}|$, with $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, attain their maximum on $\partial\mathcal{T}^1$. Moreover owing to condition (S_6) they tend to zero uniformly for large t because

$$G_{x_n,y_n}(t) \leq |\,\mathrm{e}^{-2C_2(1+|I|)t^2}\, C_1\, \mathrm{e}^{C_2(1+|I|)t^2}\, \mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)^2}\, |||\|x_n\|\|\|y_n\|, \quad t \in \mathbb{R} \cup (\mathbb{R} + \mathrm{i}),$$

with $C_1, C_2 > 0$ depending only on I and ϕ, not on x_n, y_n, t, cf. also (C.8) below. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $I_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{I}$ symmetric around 0 and sufficiently large such that $C_1 \, \mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)^2} \, \mathrm{e}^{-C_2(1+|I|)|I_\varepsilon|^2} < \varepsilon/4$ and such that $I \subset I_\varepsilon$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|G_{x_n,y_n}(t) - G_{x_m,y_m}(t)| \leq \max\{&\sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{-2C_2(1+|I|)s^2} \, |\phi(x_n\alpha_s(y_n)) - \phi(x_m\alpha_s(y_m)), \\
&\sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}} | \, \mathrm{e}^{-2C_2(1+|I|)(s+\mathrm{i})^2} \, ||\phi(\alpha_s(y_n)\gamma(x_n)) - \phi(\alpha_s(y_m)\gamma(x_m))|\} \\
\leq& \varepsilon/2 + \mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)} \max\{\sup_{s\in I_\varepsilon} |\phi((x_n - x_m)\alpha_s(y_n))| + \sup_{s\in I_\varepsilon} |\phi(\alpha_s(x_m)(y_n - y_m))|, \\
&\sup_{s\in I_\varepsilon} |\phi((y_n - y_m)\alpha_s\gamma(x_n))| + \sup_{s\in I_\varepsilon} |\phi(\alpha_s\gamma(y_m)(x_n - x_m))|\} \\
\leq& \varepsilon/2 + 2\, \mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)} \max\Big\{ \sup_{s\in I_\varepsilon} |\phi_{2I_\varepsilon}|((x_n - x_m)\alpha_s(y_n)\alpha_s(y_n)^*(x_n - x_m)^*)^{1/2} \\
&\quad + \sup_{s\in I_\varepsilon} |\phi_{2I_\varepsilon}|((y_n - y_m)^*\alpha_s(x_m)^*\alpha_s(x_m)(y_n - y_m))^{1/2}, \\
&\sup_{s\in I_\varepsilon} |\phi_{2I_\varepsilon}|((x_n - x_m)^*\alpha_s\gamma(y_n)^*\alpha_s\gamma(y_n)(x_n - x_m))^{1/2} \\
&\quad + \sup_{s\in I_\varepsilon} |\phi_{2I_\varepsilon}|((y_n - y_m)\alpha_s\gamma(x_m)\alpha_s\gamma(x_m)^*(y_n - y_m)^*)^{1/2}\Big\}
\end{aligned} \tag{C.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\leq& \varepsilon/2 + 2\, \mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)} \max\Big\{ \|y_n\| |\phi_{2I_\varepsilon}|((x_n - x_m)(x_n - x_m)^*)^{1/2} \\
&\quad + \|x_m\| |\phi_{2I_\varepsilon}|((y_n - y_m)^*(y_n - y_m))^{1/2}, \\
&\|y_n\| |\phi_{2I_\varepsilon}|((x_n - x_m)^*(x_n - x_m))^{1/2} \\
&\quad + \|x_m\| |\phi_{2I_\varepsilon}|((y_n - y_m)(y_n - y_m)^*)^{1/2}\Big\},
\end{aligned}$$

where we made use of (S_7) and (S_8), which hold on $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi} \cap \mathcal{A}(I)$ so far. Combining this with (C.1) and the local normality (S_1) of $|\phi_{2I_\varepsilon}|$, we see that the second summand is less than $\varepsilon/2$ for n, m sufficiently large, and the whole RHS is independent of $t \in \mathcal{T}^1$; in other words G_{x_n,y_n} converges uniformly to a bounded continuous limit function G on $\mathcal{T}^1$. According to Weierstrass' convergence theorem, G is actually analytic on the interior of $\mathcal{T}^1$. Moreover, since pointwise, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$G_{x_n,y_n}(t) \to \mathrm{e}^{-2C_2(1+|I|)t^2} \, \phi(x\alpha_t(y)), \quad G_{x_n,y_n}(t + \mathrm{i}) \to \mathrm{e}^{-2C_2(1+|I|)(t+\mathrm{i})^2} \, \phi(\alpha_t(y)\gamma(x)),$$

the function $F_{x,y} : t \in \mathcal{T}^1 \mapsto \mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)t^2} \, G(t)$ is analytic on the interior of $\mathcal{T}^1$ and satisfies

$$F_{x,y}(t) = \phi(x\alpha_t(y)), \quad F_{x,y}(t + \mathrm{i}) = \phi(\alpha_t(y)\gamma(x)), \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

which proves (S_2) on all of $\mathrm{dom}(\phi)_c$. □

C.2 Proofs for Section 3: model analysis

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{K} = L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^d)$ with Γ complex conjugation, and let

$$\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^d) := \mathrm{span}\{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\phi}(t) f(\cdot + t) \, \mathrm{d}\, t : \phi \in \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^d)\} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^d),$$

which is again dense in $\mathcal{K}$. We follow the lines of [RST69], but instead of the KMS condition we consider the sKMS condition. Furthermore, we work with the whole complex selfdual CAR algebra $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}, \Gamma)$ (like Araki [Ara70]) instead of the real subalgebra in [RST69].

Note that the C*-dynamical system $(\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K},\Gamma),\alpha)$ is independent of the supersymmetry, so, as explained in [RST69, Prop.1], $t\in\mathbb{R}\mapsto\alpha_t(F(f))$ extends uniquely to an analytic function on $\mathbb{C}$, for every $f\in\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d)$, and the monomials in $F(f)$, $f\in\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^d)$, lie all in $\mathfrak{A}_\alpha$. Moreover, there are two commuting selfadjoint operators $U,\mathrm{i}\,V$ satisfying the conditions in [RST69, Prop.2,3,4], with $\mathrm{i}\,V>0$ and $U>\mathbf{1}$ and preserving both $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d)$ and $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^d)$, such that $\alpha_{\mathrm{i}}(F(f))=F(Uf)+\mathrm{i}\,F(Vf)$, for all $f\in\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d)$, cf. [RST69, (2.12)&(2.13)].

Suppose there exists a functional ϕ satisfying $(S_0),(S_2),(S_3)$. We start by showing its uniqueness. Since it is defined on monomials (by assumption), we obtain an (unbounded) hermitian sesquilinear form θ on $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d)\times\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d)\subset\mathrm{dom}(\theta)\subset\mathcal{K}\times\mathcal{K}$ by $\theta(f,g)=\phi(F(f)^*F(g))$. Using hermiticity, the canonical anticommutation relation (3.1) and normalization $\phi(\mathbf{1})=1$, we find

$$\overline{\theta(g,f)}=\theta(f,g)=-\theta(\Gamma g,\Gamma f)+\langle f,g\rangle,\quad f,g\in\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d).$$

It is useful to introduce the antisymmetric real bilinear form $\eta:=\mathrm{i}(2\theta-\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$, which satisfies $\eta(\Gamma\cdot,\Gamma\cdot)=\eta$. We may choose

$$\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi}:=\ ^*\text{-alg}\{F(f):f\in\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d)\}\subset\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K},\Gamma)_\alpha\cap\mathrm{dom}(\phi)$$

since the functions $t\mapsto\phi(x\alpha_t(y))$ are analytic on $\mathcal{T}^1$, for every $x,y\in\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi}$, as shown in [BG07, Th.5.6(ii)]. Then $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi}\subset\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K},\Gamma)$ is norm-dense.

According to Proposition 2.2 the sKMS condition (S_2') holds on $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha,\phi}$:

$$\theta(f,(U+\mathrm{i}\,V)g)=-\theta(\Gamma g,\Gamma f),\quad f,g\in\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d).$$

It implies

$$\langle f,Ug\rangle-\mathrm{i}\,\eta(f,Ug)+\mathrm{i}\langle f,Vg\rangle+\eta(f,Vg)=-\langle f,g\rangle-\mathrm{i}\,\eta(f,g),\quad f,g\in\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d).$$

Considering real-valued functions in $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^d)$ as in [RST69, Lem.2], we may split the preceding equality into real and imaginary part, thereby obtaining

$$\eta(f,(U-\mathbf{1})g)=\langle f,Vg\rangle,$$

so $\eta(f,g)=\langle f,V(U-\mathbf{1})^{-1}g\rangle$ on $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d)\times(U-\mathbf{1})\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d)$. Applying [RST69, (2.18),(2.19)], we see that $\theta(f,g)$ is given by

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0^+}\frac{1}{2}\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{-\varepsilon}+\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty}\Big)\Big(1+\frac{\mathrm{e}^{-p}-\mathrm{e}^{p}}{2-\mathrm{e}^{p}-\mathrm{e}^{-p}}\Big)\overline{\hat f(p)}\hat g(p)\,\mathrm{d}\,p,$$

which clearly extends to

$$\theta(f,g)=\lim_{\varepsilon\to0^+}\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{-\varepsilon}+\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty}\Big)\frac{1}{1-\mathrm{e}^{-p}}\overline{\hat f(p)}\hat g(p)\,\mathrm{d}\,p,\quad f,g\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d),\tag{C.3}$$

and we choose $\mathrm{dom}(\theta)=\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d)\times\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d)$. Thus the 2-point function θ of ϕ is densely defined and unique. The assumption of quasi-freeness determines then ϕ completely on $\mathrm{dom}(\phi)$.

Concerning existence, notice that the above θ in (C.3) completely defines a quasi-free functional $(\phi,\mathrm{dom}(\phi))$. Since $\mathrm{dom}(\phi)_I\cap\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}_I,\Gamma)\subset\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}_I,\Gamma)$ is norm-dense, for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$, and ϕ is hermitian there, (S_0) is satisfied. (S_2) is proved like [BG07, Prop.5.7], while (S_3) is seen as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\mathbf{1}) =& \frac{1}{\|f\|_2^2}\phi(F(f)^*F(f)+F(f)F(f)^*) \\
=& \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} \frac{1}{\|f\|_2^2}\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{-\varepsilon}+\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty}\Big)\frac{1}{1-\mathrm{e}^{-p}}\Big(\overline{\hat{f}(p)}\hat{f}(p)+\hat{f}(-p)\overline{\hat{f}(-p)}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\,p \\
=& \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} \frac{1}{\|f\|_2^2}\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{-\varepsilon}+\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{1-\mathrm{e}^{-p}}+\frac{1}{1-\mathrm{e}^{p}}\Big)\overline{\hat{f}(p)}\hat{f}(p)\,\mathrm{d}\,p \\
=& \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} \frac{1}{\|f\|_2^2}\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{-\varepsilon}+\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty}\Big)\overline{\hat{f}(p)}\hat{f}(p)\,\mathrm{d}\,p \\
=& \frac{1}{\|f\|_2^2}\|\hat{f}\|_2^2 = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

We remark that (C.3) is the definition used in [BG07] and we always refer to this form henceforth. Local normality, however, has not been proved so far.

Finally we look at the case of arbitrary inverse temperature treated in Remark 3.2. Following again the above procedure, in particular [RST70, (2.18),(2.19)], we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,\beta}\phi^\beta(\mathbf{1}) =& \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,\beta}\frac{1}{\|f\|_2^2}\phi^\beta(F(f)^*F(f)+F(f)F(f)^*) \\
=& \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,\beta}\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} \frac{1}{\|f\|_2^2}\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{-\varepsilon}+\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty}\Big)\frac{1}{1-\mathrm{e}^{-\beta p}}\Big(\overline{\hat{f}(p)}\hat{f}(p)+\hat{f}(-p)\overline{\hat{f}(-p)}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\,p \\
=& \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,\beta}\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} \frac{1}{\|f\|_2^2}\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{-\varepsilon}+\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{1-\mathrm{e}^{-\beta p}}+\frac{1}{1-\mathrm{e}^{\beta p}}\Big)\overline{\hat{f}(p)}\hat{f}(p)\,\mathrm{d}\,p \qquad \text{(C.4)} \\
=& \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,\beta}\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} \frac{1}{\|f\|_2^2}\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{-\varepsilon}+\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty}\Big)\overline{\hat{f}(p)}\hat{f}(p)\,\mathrm{d}\,p \\
=& \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,\beta}\frac{1}{\|f\|_2^2}\|\hat{f}\|_2^2 = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim in Remark 3.2. □

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Let us write P_I for the orthogonal projection onto the subspace $\mathcal{K}_I = L^2(I,\mathbb{C}^d) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d) = \mathcal{K}$, for any $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Note that the vacuum state restricted to the subalgebra $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}_I,\Gamma)$ is in fact given by the quasi-free state

$$\phi_{P_+} \upharpoonright_{\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}_I,\Gamma)} = \phi_{P_I P_+ P_I} = \phi_{\tilde{P}_+}.$$

It follows from [BG07, Prop.5.6] that the sesquilinear form of ϕ is implemented by $P_+ + T$, where T is an unbounded operator with form domain $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{C}^d)$ and such that $P_I T P_I$ extends to a trace-class operator on $\mathcal{K}$, for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Fix one such I and let $S = \tilde{P}_+ + \tilde{T}$ with $\tilde{P}_+ := P_I P_+ P_I$ and $\tilde{T}$ the closure of $P_I T P_I$; these are all selfadjoint operators on $\mathcal{K}$ that can be naturally identified with selfadjoint operators on $\mathcal{K}_I$, and

$$\tilde{P}_+ + \Gamma\tilde{P}_+\Gamma = P_I(P_+ + \Gamma P_+\Gamma)P_I = P_I\mathbf{1}P_I = P_I, \quad 0 \le \tilde{P}_+ = P_I P_+ P_I \le P_I,$$

$$\tilde{T} + \Gamma\tilde{T}\Gamma = P_I(T + \Gamma T\Gamma)P_I = P_I 0 P_I = 0, \quad \tilde{T} \in L^1(\mathcal{K}_I),$$

as follows easily from the definition of P_+ in (3.3) and of $T = -\Gamma T\Gamma$ in [BG07, Th.5.6(i)], using the obvious fact that P_I commutes with the complex conjugation operator Γ.

Letting

$$\mathrm{dom}(\phi_{\mathcal{F}}) := \pi_{\phi_{P_+}}(\mathrm{dom}(\phi)) = \ ^*\text{-alg}\{\pi_{\phi_{P_+}}(F(f)) : f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)\},$$

the algebraic statements in (S_0, S_2, S_3) are automatically satisfied with respect to the induced welldefined grading and translation automorphisms

$$\pi_{\phi_{P_+}}(F(f)) \mapsto \pi_{\phi_{P_+}} \circ \gamma(F(f)), \quad \pi_{\phi_{P_+}}(F(f)) \mapsto \pi_{\phi_{P_+}} \circ \alpha_t(F(f)), \quad f \in \mathcal{K}^\Gamma,$$

denoted again by γ and α_t for simplicity.

Concerning local normality and boundedness, let us fix a bounded interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Then we infer from Theorem A.4 that $\phi_S = \phi_{\tilde{P}_+ + \tilde{T}}$ is bounded and normal in the GNS representation of $\phi_{\tilde{P}_+}$, i.e., defines a bounded normal functional $\phi_{\mathcal{F},I}$ on the C*-algebra $\pi_{\phi_{\tilde{P}_+}}(\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{K}_I, \Gamma))$ such that $\phi_{\mathcal{F},I} \circ \pi_{\phi_{\tilde{P}_+}} = \phi_{\tilde{P}_+ + \tilde{T}}$. Thus $\phi_{\mathcal{F},I}$ extends to a bounded normal functional on the σ-weak closure $\mathcal{F}(I) = \{\pi_{\phi_{P_+}}(F(f)) : f \in \mathcal{K}_I^\Gamma\}''$, such that $\phi_{\mathcal{F},I} \circ \pi_{\phi_{\tilde{P}_+}}$ coincides with ϕ on $\mathrm{dom}(\phi_{\mathcal{F}}) \cap \mathcal{F}(I)$.

Finally, the growth condition in (S_2) is seen as follows: given elements $x, y \in \mathcal{F}(I)$ for some $I \in \mathcal{I}$, we can find sequences $x_n, y_n \in \mathcal{F}(I) \cap \pi_{\phi_{P_+}}(\mathrm{dom}(\phi))$ converging σ-strongly to x and y and being uniformly bounded by $\|x\|$ and $\|y\|$, respectively, as in (C.1) (recalling that the vacuum representation is $\pi_0 = \pi_{\phi_{P_+}}$ and that $\mathrm{dom}(\phi_{P_+}) \cap \mathcal{F}(I) \subset \mathcal{F}(I)$ is σ-weakly dense). Arguing then as in (C.2), we see that the sequence of functions $t \mapsto \mathrm{e}^{-2C_2(1+|I|)t^2} F_{x_n,y_n}(t)$ converges uniformly to a bounded analytic function G on $\mathcal{T}^1$, such that $t \mapsto \mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)t^2} G(t)$ satisfies property (S_2), so the latter holds in fact on the whole algebra $\mathrm{dom}(\phi_{\mathcal{F}})$.

Uniqueness follows from uniqueness of $(\phi, \mathrm{dom}(\phi))$ in Proposition 3.1 and the definition $\mathrm{dom}(\phi_{\mathcal{F}}) := \pi_{\phi_{P_+}}(\mathrm{dom}(\phi))$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.4. The proof follows closely the local construction in [CHKL10, Sec.5] making use of the general theory in [CHKL10, Sec.2], although here we are working with the supersymmetric free field net and with α representing translation instead of rotation; we refer the reader to those places since here there is only place to roughly sketch the procedure.

The free field net $\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ is superconformal, so it contains the super-Virasoro net $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{SVir},c}$ with central charge $c = \frac{3}{2}d$ as conformal subnet, cf. [CHL12, Sec.6]. The super-Virasoro net in turn [CKL08, Sec.6] is the net generated by continuous bounded functions of unbounded selfadjoint even and odd operators $L(f), G(f)$ on $\mathcal{H}$, respectively, $f \in \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R})$, which satisfy the following (graded) commutation relations on the common invariant core $D_\infty \subset \mathcal{H}$, cf. [CLTW11b, Lem.4.5&4.6], or also [CHKL10, Sec.4] and [CHL12, Sec.6]:

$$\begin{aligned}
[L(f), L(g)] &= -\mathrm{i}\, L(f'g) + \mathrm{i}\, L(fg') + \mathrm{i}\, \frac{c}{12} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f'''g, \\
[L(f), G(g)] &= \mathrm{i}\, G(fg') - \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2} G(f'g), \\
[G(f), G(g)] &= 2L(fg) + \frac{c}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (f'g' - \frac{1}{4} fg).
\end{aligned} \tag{C.5}$$

They can be constructed out of the supersymmetric free field by the super-Sugawara construction [KT85, GKO86] (cf. also [CHL12, Sec.6]) and satisfy the following (graded) commutation relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
[J(f), L(g)] &= -\mathrm{i}\, J(f'g), \quad [F(f), L(g)] = -\mathrm{i}\, F(f'g), \\
[J(f), G(g)] &= -\mathrm{i}\, F(f'g), \quad [F(f), G(g)] = -J(fg),
\end{aligned} \tag{C.6}$$

for $f,g \in \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R})$. These relations are again to be understood weakly on the common invariant core D_∞.

Let $\phi_I \in \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R})$ denote an arbitrary but fixed function with $\phi_I \restriction_I = 1$, and set $Q_I := G(\phi_I)$, which defines the superderivation δ_{Q_I} as prescribed in (3.8). Then according to (C.6) δ_{Q_I} satisfies (3.5) on D_∞. Applying then Borel functional calculus, almost literally as in the proof of [CHL12, Prop.6.6] but with Q_I instead of Q and $J(f)$ U(1)-currents instead of G-currents, we obtain (3.6), which was to be shown. In particular, as shown in [CHKL10, Prop.5.3], δ_{Q_I} does not depend on the actual choice of $\phi_I \in \mathcal{S}_c(\mathbb{R})$ as long as $\phi_I \restriction_I = 1$.

According to the general theory of superderivations implemented as graded commutators in [CHKL10, Prop.2.1], it follows that δ_{Q_I} is really a superderivation and it is (σ-weak)-(σ-weakly) closed. □

Proof of Lemma 3.5. The generator P of the translation group is positive by assumption and preserves $\mathcal{D}_\infty \subset \mathcal{H}$, the common invariant core for all the field operators $F(f), J(f), G(f), L(f)$, with $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_I$. On this core, we have

$$L(\phi_I^2)X(f)\xi - X(f)L(\phi_I^2)\xi = \mathrm{i}\, X(f')\xi = PX(f)\xi - X(f)P\xi, \quad \xi \in \mathcal{D}_\infty,$$

according to (C.6) and the definition of P, with X standing for J, F. Passing then to resolvents and applying Borel functional calculus as in the proof of [CHL12, Prop.6.6] with Q replaced by $L(\phi_I^2) - P$, we find that

$$x(L(\phi_I^2) - P) \subset (L(\phi_I^2) - P)x + 0,$$

for all $x \in \mathfrak{A}_0 \cap \mathcal{A}(I)$ (and the inclusion is equality).

The rest of the proof goes along the lines of [CHKL10, Prop.5.6], except that we are now over $\mathbb{R}$ instead of S^1, and α implements translation instead of rotation. Given $x \in \mathfrak{A}_0 \cap \mathcal{A}(\frac{1}{2}I)$ and $h \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_{\frac{1}{2}I}$, we see that

$$Q_I \alpha_t(x)\xi = \alpha_t(Q_{I-t}x)\xi = \alpha_t(xQ_{I-t})\xi + \alpha_t(\delta_{Q_{I-t}}(x))\xi = \alpha_t(xQ_{I-t})\xi + \alpha_t(\delta_{Q_I}(x))\xi,$$

for all $t \in \frac{1}{2}I$. Thus $x_h \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta_{Q_I})$, with $\delta_{Q_I}(x_h) = (\delta_{Q_I}(x))_h$ using simply the definition of x_h. Analogously, we obtain $x_h(L(\phi_I^2) - P) = (L(\phi_I^2) - P)x_h$. But since

$$x_h = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha_t(x)h(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,t = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,tP}\, x\, \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\,tP}\, h(t)\,\mathrm{d}\,t,$$

x_h lies in the domain of the commutator with P and $[P, x_h] = \mathrm{i}\, x_{h'}$, cf. [CHKL10, Lem.2.11] and [BR97, Prop.3.2.55].

Moreover, since $x_h\xi, \delta_{Q_I}(x_h)\xi \in \mathcal{D}_\infty$, for all $\xi \in \mathcal{D}_\infty$, we may compute as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
G(\phi_I)\delta_{Q_I}(x_h)\xi =& G(\phi_I)^2 x_h\xi - G(\phi_I)\gamma(x_h)G(\phi_I)\xi \\
=& G(\phi_I)^2 x_h\xi - \delta_{Q_I}(\gamma(x_h))G(\phi_I)\xi - x_h G(\phi_I)^2\xi \\
=& L(\phi_I^2)x_h\xi - x_h L(\phi_I^2)\xi - \delta_{Q_I}(\gamma(x_h))G(\phi_I)\xi \\
=& (L(\phi_I^2) - P)x_h\xi - x_h(L(\phi_I^2) - P)\xi + Px_h\xi - x_h P\xi - \delta_{Q_I}(\gamma(x_h))G(\phi_I)\xi \\
=& Px_h\xi - x_h P\xi - \delta_{Q_I}(\gamma(x_h))G(\phi_I)\xi \\
=& \mathrm{i}\, x_{h'}\xi - \delta_{Q_I}(\gamma(x_h))G(\phi_I)\xi \\
=& \mathrm{i}\, x_{h'}\xi + \gamma(\delta_{Q_I}(x_h))G(\phi_I)\xi,
\end{aligned}$$

thus $x_h \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta_{Q_I}^2)$ with $\delta_{Q_I}^2(x_h) = \delta_0(x_h) = \mathrm{i}\, x_{h'}$. Since $h' \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})_{\frac{1}{2}I}$ again, one continues recursively to obtain the statement of the lemma.

□

Proof of the remaining part in Theorem 3.7. With assumptions and notation as above and in the proof of Theorem 3.7, we have to show

$$\psi_I \delta_I(x) = 0, \quad x \in B(I) := {}^*\text{-alg}\{y, \delta(y) : y \in \mathfrak{A}_0 \cap \mathcal{A}(I)\}.$$

We follow the proof of [BG07, Th.5.8]. Although the Weyl operators are not treated there explicitly, the strong regularity of the quasifree state $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ together with the discussion in [BG07, p.705-706 & (10)] shows that our functional ψ (as introduced there with the symbol ϕ) is well-defined on

$${}^*\text{-alg}\{F(f)(J(f)+\mathrm{i})^{-1}, J(f), (J(f)+\mathrm{i})^{-1}, W(f) : f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^d)_I\},$$

so in particular on $B(I)$, which generalizes [BG07, Lem.8.2]. With $f_i \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^d)_I$, we calculate as in the proof of [BG07, Th.5.8] (writing $R(f)$ for $(J(f)+\mathrm{i})^{-1}$), with integers $0 \le l \le m \le n$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi \circ \delta\Big(&F(f_1)\cdots F(f_l)R(f_1)\cdots R(f_l)J(f_{l+1})\cdots J(f_m)W(f_{m+1})\cdots W(f_n)\Big)\\
&= (-1)^l(-\mathrm{i})^{m-l}\int_0^\infty \frac{\partial^{m-l}}{\partial t_{l+1}\cdots\partial t_m}\\
&\qquad \psi\circ\delta\Big(F(f_1)\cdots F(f_l)W(t_1f_1)\cdots W(t_nf_n)\Big)\,\mathrm{e}^{-t_1-\ldots-t_l}\,\mathrm{d}\,t_1\cdots\mathrm{d}\,t_l \restriction_{t_{m+1}\ldots t_n=1}^{t_{l+1}\ldots t_m=0}\\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{l}(-1)^{i-1}\psi\Big(F(f_1)\cdots\overset{i}{\vee}\cdots F(f_l)\Big)(-1)^l(-\mathrm{i})^{m-l}\int_0^\infty -\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\partial^{m-l+1}}{\partial t_0\partial t_{l+1}\cdots\partial t_m}\\
&\qquad \psi\Big(W(t_0f_i)W(t_1f_1)\cdots W(t_nf_n)\Big)\,\mathrm{e}^{-t_1-\ldots-t_l}\,\mathrm{d}\,t_1\cdots\mathrm{d}\,t_l \restriction_{t_{m+1}\ldots t_n=1}^{t_0,t_{l+1}\ldots t_m=0}\\
&\quad + (-1)^l\sum_{k=1}^{n}\psi\Big(F(f_1)\cdots F(f_l)F(f_k')\Big)(-1)^l(-\mathrm{i})^{m-l}\int_0^\infty \frac{\partial^{m-l}}{\partial t_{l+1}\cdots\partial t_m}\\
&\qquad \psi\Big(W(t_0f_i)W(t_1f_1)\cdots W(t_nf_n)\Big)(-t_k)\,\mathrm{e}^{-t_1-\ldots-t_l}\,\mathrm{d}\,t_1\cdots\mathrm{d}\,t_l \restriction_{t_{m+1}\ldots t_n=1}^{t_0,t_{l+1}\ldots t_m=0}\ .
\end{aligned}$$

By means of derivatives and Laplace transforms, we reduced everything on the bosonic free field part to products of Weyl unitaries because for the latter ones we have the following handy expression (from [BG07, p.706&(15)]):

$$\psi(W(f_1)\cdots W(f_n)) = \exp\Big(-\sum_{j<k}\mathrm{i}\,\theta(f_j,f_k') - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathrm{i}\,\theta(f_j,f_k')\Big),$$

where θ is the two-point function for ϕ defined in (3.4). The quasifreeness of ϕ implies that the above expression can be nonzero only if l is odd, which we shall assume from now on. It implies also that products of $(l+1)$ fields can be split into 2 and $(l-1)$ in the usual manner, so that we obtain for the above expression

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi \circ \delta\Big(&F(f_1)\cdots F(f_l)R(f_1)\cdots R(f_l)J(f_{l+1})\cdots J(f_m)W(f_{m+1})\cdots W(f_n)\Big)\\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{l}(-1)^{i}\psi\Big(F(f_1)\cdots\overset{i}{\vee}\cdots F(f_l)\Big)(-\mathrm{i})^{m-l}\int_0^\infty \frac{\partial^{m-l}}{\partial t_{l+1}\cdots\partial t_m}\\
&\qquad \Big(-\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\partial}{\partial t_0} - \sum_{k=1}^{n}(-t_k)\phi(F(f_i)F(f_k'))\Big)\\
&\qquad \psi\Big(W(t_0f_i)W(t_1f_1)\cdots W(t_nf_n)\Big)\,\mathrm{e}^{-t_1-\ldots-t_l}\,\mathrm{d}\,t_1\cdots\mathrm{d}\,t_l \restriction_{t_{m+1}\ldots t_n=1}^{t_0,t_{l+1}\ldots t_m=0}
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
=&\sum_{i=1}^{l}(-1)^i\psi\Big(F(f_1)\cdots\overset{i}{\vee}\cdots F(f_l)\Big)(-\mathrm{i})^{m-l}\int_0^\infty\frac{\partial^{m-l}}{\partial t_{l+1}\cdots\partial t_m}\\
&\quad\Big(-\mathrm{i}\sum_{j=1}^{n}t_j(-\mathrm{i})\theta(f_i,f_j)-\sum_{k=1}^{n}(-t_k)\theta(f_i,f_k')\Big)\\
&\quad\psi\Big(W(t_0f_i)W(t_1f_1)\cdots W(t_nf_n)\Big)\,\mathrm{e}^{-t_1-\ldots-t_l}\,\mathrm{d}\,t_1\cdots\mathrm{d}\,t_l\restriction^{t_0,t_{l+1}\ldots t_m=0}_{t_{m+1}\ldots t_n=1}\\
=&0
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus $\psi\circ\delta=0$ on $B(I)$, for every $I\in\mathcal{I}$. □

C.3 Proofs for Section 4: JLO cocycles

Proof of Proposition 4.2. We have to prove the (analytical) entireness condition and the (algebraic) cocycle condition.The proof of the former one coincides almost literally with that of [BG07, Th.6.3]: since our functional is assumed to be local-exponentially bounded (S_6), the crucial first equation on $\mathcal{A}_0(J)$ in that proof is fulfilled in our context on the whole local von Neumann algebras $\mathcal{A}(J)\equiv\mathcal{A}(J)$, and the rest of the proof continues literally as written there.

Concerning the cocycle property on $\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_I$, for all $I\in\mathcal{I}$, we follow now the proof of [BG07, Th.6.4]. The only thing to be established here is the corresponding version of [BG07, Lem.8.6], i.e.,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{t\to\mathrm{i}\,s}&\phi\Big(\delta(x_0)\alpha_{ts_1}(\delta x_1)\cdots\alpha_{ts_n}(\delta x_n)\Big)\\
&=\mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{t\to\mathrm{i}\,s}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\partial}{\partial t_j}\phi\Big((\gamma x_0)\alpha_{t_1}(\gamma\delta x_1)\cdots\\
&\qquad\cdots\alpha_{t_{j-1}}(\gamma\delta x_{j-1})\alpha_{t_j}(x_j)\alpha_{t_{j+1}}(\delta x_{j+1})\cdots\alpha_{t_n}(\delta a_n)\Big),
\end{aligned}
\tag{C.7}
$$

for $x_i\in\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_I$ and $s\in\Delta_n$. Since δ preserves $\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$, the present version of (C.7) is actually much easier to prove. The rest goes through as written there, with $\mathcal{D}_c$ replaced by $\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_I$.

To this end, recall that the superderivation property *(ii)* implies

$$
\delta(x_0)\cdots\delta(x_n)=\delta(x_0\delta(x_1)\cdots\delta(x_n))-\sum_{j=1}^{n}\gamma(x_0\delta(x_1)\cdots.\delta(x_{j-1}))\delta^2(x_j)\delta(x_{j+1})\cdots\delta(x_n),
$$

and that α_{t_j} commutes with δ according to *(i)*. Combining this first with property (S_4) and then with (S_5), we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\phi\Big(\delta(x_0)\alpha_{t_1}(\delta x_1)\cdots\alpha_{t_n}(\delta(x_n))\Big)\\
&=-\sum_{j=1}^{n}\phi\Big((\gamma x_0)\alpha_{t_1}(\gamma\delta(x_1))\cdots\alpha_{t_{j-1}}(\gamma\delta(x_{j-1}))\alpha_{t_j}(\delta^2(x_j))\alpha_{t_{j+1}}(\delta(x_{j+1}))\cdots\alpha_{t_n}(\delta(x_n))\Big)\\
&=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\partial}{\partial t_j}\phi\Big((\gamma x_0)\alpha_{t_1}(\gamma\delta(x_1))\cdots\alpha_{t_{j-1}}(\gamma\delta(x_{j-1}))\alpha_{t_j}(x_j)\alpha_{t_{j+1}}(\delta(x_{j+1}))\cdots\alpha_{t_n}(\delta(x_n))\Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

As in (4.1), the two functions

$$
\begin{aligned}
t \in \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto & \phi\Big(\delta(x_0)\alpha_{t_1}(\delta x_1)\cdots\alpha_{t_n}(\delta(x_n))\Big),\\
t \in \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto & \,\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\partial}{\partial t_j}\phi\Big((\gamma x_0)\alpha_{t_1}(\gamma\delta(x_1))\cdots\alpha_{t_{j-1}}(\gamma\delta(x_{j-1}))\alpha_{t_j}(x_j)\alpha_{t_{j+1}}(\delta(x_{j+1}))\cdots\alpha_{t_n}(\delta(x_n))\Big)
\end{aligned}
$$

extend to analytic functions on the tube $\mathcal{T}^n$ coinciding on $\mathbb{R}^n$. With the special choice $z = \mathrm{i}\,s \in \mathcal{T}^n$, we obtain (C.7). ☐

Proof of Proposition 4.3. We treat only α_t^r since γ_t^r can be treated by similar methods. The proof is inspired by [JLW89, Th.III.1]. Applying (4.2), we notice that the n-th term in the sum defining $\phi(x\alpha_t^r(y)z)$, with $t \in \mathbb{R}$, is bounded by

$$
\frac{|t|^n}{n!}(2\|a_r\|\,\mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)^2}\,\mathrm{e}^{C_2(1+|I|)t^2})^{n+1}\|x\|\|y\|\|z\| \leq \frac{|t|^n}{n!}(2\|a_r\|\,\mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|+t^2)^2})^{n+1}\|x\|\|y\|\|z\| \tag{C.8}
$$

so the convergence is clear. Considering the difference $\phi(x\alpha_t^r(y)z) - \phi(x\alpha_t^q(y)z)$ and remembering $a_r \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$, we have in a similar manner for the n-th term in the sum the following upper bound:

$$
\begin{aligned}
|t|^n\Big|\int_{\Delta_n} & \phi\Big(x\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{ts_1}(a_r))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{ts_n}(a_r))(y)z - x\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{ts_1}(a_q))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{ts_n}(a_q))\alpha_t(y)z\Big)\,\mathrm{d}^n s\Big|\\
=&|t|^n\int_{\Delta_n}\Big|\sum_{k=1}^{n}\phi\Big(x\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{ts_1}(a_r))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{ts_k}(a_r))\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{ts_{k+1}}(a_q))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{ts_n}(a_q))\alpha_t(y)z\\
&\quad - x\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{ts_1}(a_r))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{ts_{k-1}}(a_r))\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{ts_k}(a_q))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{ts_n}(a_q))\alpha_t(y)z\Big)\,\mathrm{d}^n s\Big|\\
\leq&\frac{|t|^n}{n!}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\|a_r\|^{k-1}\|a_r - a_q\|\|a_q\|^{n-k}(2\,\mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|+t^2)^2})^{n+1}\|x\|\|y\|\|z\|\\
\leq&\frac{|t|^n}{(n-1)!}(\|a_r\|^{n-1} + \|a_q\|^{n-1})\|a_r - a_q\|(2\,\mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|+t^2)^2})^{n+1}\|x\|\|y\|\|z\|
\end{aligned}
$$

Summing over n and using the power series expansion of the exponential function and $\|a_r - a_s\| \leq 2|r-s|(\|\delta(Q)\| + \|Q^2\|)$, we obtain the stated upper bound.

We want to check the group property of α^r, using the group property of α:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi(x\alpha_{t_1}^r\alpha_{t_2}^r(y)z) =& \sum_{n_1\in\mathbb{N}_0}\sum_{n_2\in\mathbb{N}_0}\mathrm{i}^{n_1+n_2}\int_{\Delta_{n_1}^{t_1}}\int_{\Delta_{n_2}^{t_2}}\phi\Big(x\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{s_1}(a_r))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{s_n}(a_r))\\
&\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{t_1+s_{n_1+1}}(a_r))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{t_1+s_{n_1+n_2}}(a_r))(\alpha_{t_1+t_2}(y))z\Big)\,\mathrm{d}^{n_2}s\,\mathrm{d}^{n_1}s\\
=&\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{n_1=0}^{n}\mathrm{i}^n\int_{\Delta_{n_1}^{t_1}}\int_{\Delta_{n-n_1}^{t_2}}\phi\Big(x\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{s_1}(a_r))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{s_n}(a_r))\\
&\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{t_1+s_{n_1+1}}(a_r))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{t_1+s_n}(a_r))(\alpha_{t_1+t_2}(y))z\Big)\,\mathrm{d}^{n-n_1}s\,\mathrm{d}^{n_1}s\\
=&\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}\mathrm{i}^n\int_{\Delta_n^{t_1+t_2}}\phi\Big(x\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{s_1}(a_r))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{s_n}(a_r))(\alpha_{t_1+t_2}(y))z\Big)\,\mathrm{d}^n s\\
=&\phi(x\alpha_{t_1+t_2}^r(y)z).
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\operatorname{sgn} t_1 = \operatorname{sgn} t_2$, this is all. Otherwise, the third equality follows from a few elementary intermediate steps, which we skip here. As a consequence, $\alpha_t^r\alpha_{-t}^r = \alpha_0^r = \mathrm{id}$ proves invertibility, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The fact that they are algebra homomorphisms, i.e.,

$$
\phi(x\alpha_t^r(y_1y_2)z) = \phi(x\alpha_t^r(y_1)\alpha_t^r(y_2)z), \quad x, z \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)_c,\ y_1, y_2 \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c,
$$

follows immediately from the definition of α_t^r.

Concerning

$$\phi(x\delta_r^2(y)z) = -\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\phi(x\alpha_t^r(y)z)\restriction_{t=0},$$

we recall that both a_r and y lie in $\mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_I$, by assumption. Thus term-by-term differentiation of the series defining $\phi(x\alpha_t^r(y)z)$ yields a convergent series again with nonzero contribution only for the zeroth and first summand, namely

$$\begin{aligned}-\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\phi\big(x\alpha_t^r(y)z\big)\restriction_{t=0}=&-\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\phi\big(x\alpha_t(y)z\big)\restriction_{t=0}+-\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\,\mathrm{i}\int_0^t\phi\big(x\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_s(a_r))(\alpha_t(y)))z\big)\,\mathrm{d}\,s\restriction_{t=0}\\ =&\phi\big(x\delta^2(y)z\big)+\phi\big(x(\mathrm{ad}(a_r)(y))z\big)=\phi\big(x\delta_r^2(y)z\big),\end{aligned}$$

making use of the weak supersymmetry property (S_5) of α. We call $\delta_r^2 = \delta^2 + \mathrm{ad}(a_r)$ the *ϕ-weak generator of α^r*.

The proof for γ^r goes similarly, with ϕ-weak generator $\delta^2 + a_r$, i.e.,

$$-\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\phi\big(x\gamma_t^r(y)z\big)\restriction_{t=0}=\phi\big(x(\delta^2(y)+a_r y)z\big).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 4.5. Notice first that, for every $x, y, z \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$, the function

$$(t,u)\in\mathbb{R}^2\mapsto\phi(x\gamma_t^r(y)\alpha_u(z))=\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}(\mathrm{i}\,t)^n\int_{\Delta_n^1}\phi\big(x\alpha_{s_1t}(a_r)\cdots\alpha_{s_nt}(a_r)\alpha_u(yz)\big)\,\mathrm{d}^n\,s,$$

has a continuation to the tube $\mathcal{T}^2 = \{(t,u) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : 0 \le \Im(t) \le \Im(u) \le 1\}$ which is analytic on the interior of $\mathcal{T}^2$; the continuation is performed summand-wise, using (4.2) and the explanation given before that equation: in fact, one shows that the series defining $\phi(x\gamma_t^r(y)\alpha_u(z))$ converges compactly, so we are done by applying Weierstrass' convergence criterion.

We have to check the sKMS property (S_2), and we may do this summand-wise again. Given $x, z \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)_c$, let

$$F_{x,z}(t) := \mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{s\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(x\alpha_t^r(z)\gamma_s^r(\mathbf{1})),\quad t\in\mathbb{R}.$$

It has an analytic continuation to $\mathcal{T}^1$ owing to the sKMS property for ϕ and the above reasoning. We have to show that $F_{x,z}(t+\mathrm{i}) = \mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{s\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(\alpha_t^r(z)\gamma(x)\gamma_s^r(\mathbf{1}))$. We claim that

$$\phi(ze(t))=0,\quad e(t):=\delta(\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1}))+rQ\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})-r\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})\alpha_t(Q),\tag{C.9}$$

and

$$\phi(xf(t))=0,\quad f(t):=\alpha_t^r(z)\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})-\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})\alpha_t(z),\tag{C.10}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Once this is proved, we obtain (S_2) as as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}F_{x,z}(t+\mathrm{i})&=\mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{s\to t+\mathrm{i},u\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(x\alpha_s^r(z)\gamma_u^r(\mathbf{1}))\\&=\mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{u\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(x\alpha_u^r(\alpha_t^r(z))\gamma_u^r(\mathbf{1}))\\&=\mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{u\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(x\gamma_u^r(\mathbf{1})\alpha_u(\alpha_t^r(z)))\\&=\mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{u,v\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(x\gamma_u^r(\mathbf{1})\alpha_v(\alpha_t^r(z)))\\&=\mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{u\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(\alpha_t^r(z)\gamma(x)\gamma_u^r(\mathbf{1})),\end{aligned}\tag{C.11}$$

where multiple analytic continuations are always performed in such a way that $\Im(s) \le \Im(u) \le \Im(v)$ for complex variables s, t, u, in order to remain in the corresponding tube $\mathcal{T}^3$

where they are defined. Note that the third line follows from (C.10), while the last line is a consequence of the sKMS property for (ϕ, α), noting that both $x\gamma_u^r(\mathbf{1})$ and $\alpha_t^r(z)$ are localized and smooth.

Proof of the claim. First of all, note that owing to the sKMS condition on ϕ and a similar reasoning as in the preceding proof of Proposition 4.3, $E : t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \phi(ze(t))$ extends to a continuous function on the whole strip $\mathcal{T}^1$ which is analytic on the interior of $\mathcal{T}^1$ and differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$. Differentiation by t together with properties (S_4) and (S_5) for ϕ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
-\mathrm{i}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}E(t) =&\phi\big(z(\delta + rQ)(\delta^2 + a_r)(\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})) - z(\delta^2 + a_r)(\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})\alpha_t(rQ))\big)\\
=&\phi\big(z(\delta^2 + a_r)e(t)\big)\\
=&\phi\big(\delta^2(ze(t))\big) - \phi\big(\delta^2(z)e(t)\big) + \phi\big(za_r e(t)\big)\\
=&-\phi\big((\delta^2 - a_r)(z)e(t)\big), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recursively one finds $z_{r,n} \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c$ such that

$$\mathrm{i}^{-n}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}^n}{\mathrm{d}\,t^n}E(t) = \phi\big((\delta^2 + a_r)^n(z)e(t)\big) = \phi\big(z_{r,n}e(t)\big), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since all $z_{r,n}e(t)$ are localized (uniformly for t in bounded intervals) and ϕ is locally bounded, all derivatives of E are continuous; in other words, E is smooth on $\mathbb{R}$ and furthermore, according to our preceding discussion, analytic on the interior of $\mathcal{T}^1$. Since $e(0) = 0$, we get for all derivatives: $E^{(n)}(0) = 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Applying the C^∞-version of Schwarz' reflection principle [BL90, Th.1] shows that $E \equiv 0$ on the whole strip $\mathcal{T}^1$. The function f in (C.9) is treated analogously, so we are done with our claim.

We have to check the remaining conditions for sKMS functionals. We may choose $\mathrm{dom}(\phi^r) = \mathrm{dom}(\phi)$ since $\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})$ is smooth and localized. With $\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1}) = \alpha_t(\gamma_{-t}^r(\mathbf{1})^*)$ and the sKMS condition for (ϕ, γ, α) and arguing as in (C.11), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi^r(x^*) &= \mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{t\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(x^*\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})) = \mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{t\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(x^*\alpha_t(\gamma_{-t}^r(\mathbf{1})^*))\\
&= \mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{t,u\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(x^*\alpha_u(\gamma_{-t}^r(\mathbf{1})^*)) = \mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{t\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(\gamma_{-t}^r(\mathbf{1})^*\gamma(x^*))\\
&= \mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{t\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi\gamma(\gamma_{-t}^r(\mathbf{1})^*x^*) = \mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{t\to\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(\gamma_{-t}^r(\mathbf{1})^*x^*)\\
&= \mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{t\to\mathrm{i}}\,\overline{\phi(x\gamma_{-t}^r(\mathbf{1}))} = \overline{\mathrm{anal.\,cont}_{t\to-\mathrm{i}}\,\phi(x\gamma_{-t}^r(\mathbf{1}))} = \overline{\phi^r(x)}
\end{aligned}$$

so (S_0) is verified.

Let I be large enough so that $Q \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)_I$. We have already seen that, for every $r \in [0,1]$ and $x \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)_I$, the map $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \phi(x\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1}))$ extends to an analytic function on $\mathcal{T}^1$; in fact, for every $t \in \mathcal{T}^1$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
|\phi(x\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1}))| \leq&\Big|\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(-t)^n\int_{\Delta_n}\phi(x\alpha_{s_1 t}(a_r)\cdots\alpha_{s_n t}(a_r))\,\mathrm{d}^n\,s\Big|\\
\leq&\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}|t|^n\frac{1}{n!}\,\mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|+t^2)^2(n+1)}\,\|a_r\|^n\|x\|,
\end{aligned} \tag{C.12}$$

and choosing $t = \mathrm{i}$, we get $C_I > 0$ independent of x such that (C.12) is bounded by $C_I\|x\|$. Thus we have local boundedness of ϕ^r for sufficiently large interval I, hence for all intervals (by isotony). We expect, however, neither local-exponential boundedness nor local normality for ϕ^r, so we have a weak version of (S_1), but no (S_6).

The normalization property $\phi^r(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ will be shown in (C.20) as a corollary of the proof of Theorem 4.6, which does not make use of (S_3) but instead only of the finiteness of $\phi^r(\mathbf{1})$.

Concerning (S_4), we have to show $\phi^r\delta_r(z)=0$. Using first $\phi\delta=0$ and then (C.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi^r\delta_r(z) =& \operatorname{anal.cont}_{t\to \mathrm{i}}\,\phi\big(\delta(z)\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})+r(Qz-\gamma(z)Q)\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})\big)\\
=& \operatorname{anal.cont}_{t,u\to \mathrm{i}}\,\phi\big(-\gamma(z)\delta(\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1}))-r\gamma(z)Q\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})+r\gamma(z)\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})\alpha_u(Q)\big)\\
=& -\operatorname{anal.cont}_{t\to \mathrm{i}}\,\phi\big(\gamma(z)\delta(\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1}))+r\gamma(z)Q\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})\big)-r\gamma(z)\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})\alpha_t(Q)\big)=0.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if (ϕ,δ) satisfies (S_4'), then so does (ϕ^r,δ_r). Finally, (S_5) is shown in a similar way as (S_2). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.6. The proof of the first statement is identical with the one of [BG07, Th.6.3&6.4] stated there for the case of the supersymmetric free field.

Let us study the perturbed functionals. We shall need the following functions, for $n\in\mathbb{N}$:

$$F_n(x_0,..,x_n):=\operatorname{anal.cont}_{t\to \mathrm{i}}\int_{\Delta_n}\phi(x_0\alpha_{s_1t}(x_1)\cdots\alpha_{s_nt}(x_n))\,\mathrm{d}^n s,\quad x_i\in\operatorname{dom}(\phi)_c,$$

In particular, we can rewrite

$$\tau_n(x_0,...,x_n)=F_n(x_0,\delta(x_1),...,\delta(x_n)).$$

Suppose x_i, Q are localized over a certain $I\in\mathcal{I}$. Then by definition of α^r and γ^r and applying (4.2), we have (with the usual multi-index notation), for $s_i\in\mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\phi(x_0\alpha_{s_1}^r(x_1)...\alpha_{s_n}^r(x_n)\gamma_{s_{n+1}}^r(\mathbf{1}))|\\
&\quad\le\sum_{\vec{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^{n+1}}\int_{\Delta_{k_1}^{s_1}}\cdots\int_{\Delta_{k_{n+1}}^{s_{n+1}}}\\
&\qquad\mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)^2(|\vec{k}|+1)}\,\mathrm{e}^{C_2(1+|I|)\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\sum_{l_i=1}^{k_i}t_{i,l_i}^2}\,\|a_r\|^{|\vec{k}|}\cdot\|x_0\|\cdots\|x_n\|\,\mathrm{d}^{k_1}t_1\cdots\mathrm{d}^{k_{n+1}}t_{n+1}\\
&\quad\le\sum_{\vec{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0^{n+1}}\mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)^2(|\vec{k}|+1)}\,\mathrm{e}^{C_2(1+|I|)\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}k_is_i^2}\,\frac{1}{\vec{k}!}\vec{s}^{\vec{k}}\|a_r\|^{|\vec{k}|}\cdot\|x_0\|\cdots\|x_n\|\\
&\quad\le\exp\Big(2C_2(1+|I|)^2\Big(|s_1|\,\mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)^2(s_1+1)^2}+...+|s_{n+1}|\,\mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)^2(s_{n+1}^2+1)}\Big)\|a_r\|\Big)\cdot\|x_0\|\cdots\|x_n\|\\
&\quad\le\exp\Big(2C_2(1+|I|)^2\max_i(|s_i|)\,\mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)^2(\max_i s_i^2+1)}\,\|a_r\|\Big)\cdot\|x_0\|\cdots\|x_n\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where $t_{i,l_i}\le s_i$; thus the function

$$s\in\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\mapsto\phi(x_0\alpha_{s_1}^r(x_1)\cdots\alpha_{s_n}^r(x_n)\gamma_{s_{n+1}}^r(\mathbf{1})),$$

which is defined by a compactly convergent series of analytically continuable functions, can be analytically continued to $\mathcal{T}^{n+1}$, with upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\phi(x_0\alpha_{s_1}^r(x_1)\cdots\alpha_{s_n}^r(x_n)\gamma_{s_{n+1}}^r(\mathbf{1}))|\\
&\qquad\le\exp\Big(2C_2(1+|I|)^2\max_i(|s_i|)\,\mathrm{e}^{2C_2(1+|I|)^2(\max_i s_i^2+1)}\,\|a_r\|\Big)\cdot\|x_0\|\cdots\|x_n\|
\end{aligned}$$

arguing in the same way as in (C.12). Integration over $\mathrm{i}\,\Delta_n$ then gives rise to the well-defined $F_n^r(x_0,...,x_n)$, and for the corresponding JLO cochain τ^r we therefore find, for every $I\in\mathcal{I}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n}\|\tau_n^r\restriction_{\operatorname{dom}(\delta^\infty)_I^\gamma}\|_*^{1/n}\le&\sqrt{n}\Big(\frac{1}{n!}\exp\big((n+1)2C_2(1+|I|)^2\,\mathrm{e}^{4C_2(1+|I|)^2}\,\|a_r\|\big)\Big)^{1/n}\\
\sim&\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\exp\Big(2C_2(1+|I|)^2\,\mathrm{e}^{4C_2(1+|I|)^2}\,\|a_r\|\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

asymptotically, which tends to 0 for $n \to \infty$, so τ^r is in fact local-entire. The cyclic cocycle condition is purely algebraic and verified as in the case of τ.

Concerning the perturbation invariance of the cyclic cocycle τ, we would like to show that

$$G^r_{n-1}(x_0, ..., x_{n-1}) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (-1)^k F^r_n(x_0, \delta_r(x_1), ..., \delta_r(x_k), Q, ...\delta_r(x_{n-1})) \tag{C.13}$$

defines a local-entire cochain such that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\, r} \tau^r = \partial G^r. \tag{C.14}$$

It is clearly well-defined, and the local-entireness condition of the chain $(G^r_n)_{n \in 2\mathbb{N}_0+1}$ is verified in the same way as for the JLO cochain $(\tau^r_n)_{n \in 2\mathbb{N}_0}$ above.

Let us turn to the cocycle condition. We recall the following equalities from [BG07, Lem.8.5], for $x_i \in \mathrm{dom}(\phi)_c$ (which are proved there for the case $r = 0$ but hold in fact for arbitrary r since $(\phi^r, \gamma, \alpha^r, \delta_r)$ satisfy analogous algebraic relations):

$$F^r_n(x_0, ..., x_n) = F^r_n(\gamma(x_n), x_0, ..., x_{n-1}) \tag{C.15}$$

$$F^r_n(x_0, x_1, ..., \delta^2_r(x_j), ..., x_n) = F^r_{n-1}(x_0, ..., x_{j-1}x_j, ..., x_n) - F^r_{n-1}(x_0, ..., x_j x_{j+1}, ..., x_n) \tag{C.16}$$

$$F^r_n(x_0, x_1, ..., x_{n-1}, \delta^2_r(x_n)) = F^r_{n-1}(x_0, ..., x_{n-1}x_n) - F^r_{n-1}(\gamma(x_n)x_0, x_1, ..., x_{n-1}) \tag{C.17}$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} F^r_{n+1}(\mathbf{1}, x_j, ..., x_n, \gamma(x_0), ..., \gamma(x_{j-1})) = F_n(x_0, ..., x_n). \tag{C.18}$$

Moreover, the derivation invariance (S_4) says $\phi^r \delta_r = 0$, which implies

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} F^r_n(\gamma(x_0), ..., \gamma(x_{j-1}), \delta_r(x_j), x_{j+1}, ..., x_n) = 0, \quad x_i \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta)_c. \tag{C.19}$$

Applying them to the definition of the operator B, we obtain (now with $\gamma(x_i) = x_i$ and $\gamma(Q) = -Q$ all in $\mathrm{dom}(\delta)$ and $n \in 2\mathbb{N}_0$ even):

$$\begin{aligned} BG^r_{n+1}(x_0, ..., x_n) =& \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^{nj} G^r_{n+1}(\mathbf{1}, x_j, ..., x_{j-1}) \\ =& \sum_{j=0}^{n} \Big(\sum_{k=0}^{j-1} (-1)^{n(j+1)} (-1)^{k+2-j} F^r_{n+1}(\mathbf{1}, \delta_r(x_j), ..., \delta_r(x_k), Q, ...\delta_r(x_{j-1})) \\ &+ \sum_{k=j}^{n} (-1)^{nj} (-1)^{k+1-j} F^r_{n+1}(\mathbf{1}, \delta_r(x_j), ..., \delta_r(x_k), Q, ...\delta_r(x_{j-1})) \Big) \\ =& \sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^{k+1} \Big(\sum_{j=0}^{k} (-1)^{(n+1)j} F^r_{n+1}(\mathbf{1}, \delta_r(x_j), ..., \delta_r(x_k), Q, ...\delta_r(x_{j-1})) \\ &+ \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} (-1)^{(n+1)(j+1)} F^r_{n+1}(\mathbf{1}, \delta_r(x_j), ..., \delta_r(x_k), Q, ...\delta_r(x_{j-1})) \Big) \\ =& - \sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^k F^r_n(\delta_r(x_0), ..., \delta_r(x_k), Q, ..., \delta_r(x_n)), \end{aligned}$$

using (C.18) in the last line together with the fact that all $\delta_r(x_i)$ and Q are homogeneously odd. The same equalities are used in the case of b, where we obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
bG^r_{n-1}(x_0,..,x_n) &= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}(-1)^j G^r_{n-1}(x_0,...,x_jx_{j+1},...,x_n) + (-1)^n G^r_{n-1}(x_nx_0,x_1,...,x_{n-1}) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\Big(\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}(-1)^{j+k}F^r_n(x_0,\delta_r(x_1)...,\delta_r(x_k),Q,...,\delta_r(x_jx_{j+1}),...,\delta_r(x_n)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=j+1}^{n}(-1)^{j+k-1}F^r_n(x_0,\delta_r(x_1),...,\delta_r(x_jx_{j+1}),...,\delta_r(x_k),Q,...,\delta_r(x_n))\Big) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(-1)^{n+k}F^r_n(x_nx_0,\delta_r(x_1),...,\delta_r(x_k),Q,...,\delta_r(x_{n-1}))
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n}\Big(-\sum_{j=0}^{k}(-1)^{j+k-1}F^r_{n+1}(x_0,\delta_r(x_1),...,\delta^2_r(x_j),...,\delta_r(x_k),Q,...,\delta_r(x_n)) \\
&\quad - \sum_{j=k+1}^{n}(-1)^{j+k}F^r_{n+1}(x_0,\delta_r(x_1)...,\delta_r(x_k),Q,...,\delta^2_r(x_j),...,\delta_r(x_n))\Big) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{n}(-1)^{2k-1}F^r_n(x_0,\delta_r(x_1)...,\delta_r(x_{k-1}),x_kQ,...,\delta_r(x_n)) \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1}^{n}(-1)^{2k-1}F^r_n(x_0,\delta_r(x_1)...,\delta_r(x_{k-1}),Qx_k,...,\delta_r(x_n)) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n}\Big(-\sum_{j=0}^{k}(-1)^{j+k-1}F^r_{n+1}(x_0,\delta_r(x_1),...,\delta^2_r(x_j),...,\delta_r(x_k),Q,...,\delta_r(x_n)) \\
&\quad - \sum_{j=k+1}^{n}(-1)^{j+k}F^r_{n+1}(x_0,\delta_r(x_1)...,\delta_r(x_k),Q,...,\delta^2_r(x_j),...,\delta_r(x_n))\Big) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{n}F^r_n(x_0,\delta_r(x_1)...,\delta_r(x_{k-1}),[Q,x_k],...,\delta_r(x_n)) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n}(-1)^kF^r_{n+1}(\delta_r(x_0),\delta_r(x_1),...,\delta_r(x_k),Q,...,\delta_r(x_n)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{n}(-1)^{k+k}F^r_{n+1}(x_0,\delta_r(x_1),...,\delta_r(x_k),\delta_r(Q),...,\delta_r(x_n)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{n}F^r_n(x_0,\delta_r(x_1),...,[Q,x_k],...,\delta_r(x_n)),
\end{aligned}
$$

using (C.19) in the last equality.

Let us turn to the LHS of (C.14): we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\, r}\phi\big(x\alpha_t^r(y)z\big) &= \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}(\mathrm{i})^n\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\, r}\int_{\Delta_n^t}\phi\big(x\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{p_1}(a_r))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{p_n}(a_r))\alpha_t(y)z\big)\,\mathrm{d}^n\, p \\
&= \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}\sum_{k=0}^{n}(\mathrm{i})^n\int_0^t\int_{\Delta_k^s}\int_{\Delta_{n-k}^{t-s}}\phi\big(x\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{p_1}(a_r))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{p_k}(a_r)) \\
&\qquad \cdot\alpha_s\left(\mathrm{ad}(\dot{a}_r)\,\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{p_{k+1}}(a_r))\cdots\mathrm{ad}(\alpha_{p_n}(a_r))\alpha_{t-s}(y)\big)\ z\right)\mathrm{d}^{n-k}\, p\,\mathrm{d}^k\, p\,\mathrm{d}\, s \\
&= \int_0^t\phi\big(x\alpha_s^r([\dot{a}_r,\alpha_{t-s}^r(y)])z\big)\,\mathrm{d}\, s \\
&= \int_0^t\phi\big(x[\alpha_s^r(\delta_r(Q)),\alpha_t^r(y)]z\big)\,\mathrm{d}\, s,
\end{aligned}$$

using $\dot{a}_r = \delta_r(Q)$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\, r}\phi\big(x\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})\big) &= \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}\sum_{k=0}^{n}\mathrm{i}^{n+1}\int_0^t\int_{\Delta_k^s}\int_{\Delta_{n-k}^{t-s}}\phi\big(x\alpha_{p_1}(a_r)\cdots\alpha_{p_k}(a_r) \\
&\qquad \cdot\alpha_s\left(\dot{a}_r\alpha_{p_{k+1}}(a_r)\cdots\alpha_{p_n}(a_r)\alpha_{t-s}(x)\big)\ \right)\mathrm{d}^{n-k}\, p\,\mathrm{d}^k\, p\,\mathrm{d}\, s \\
&= \int_0^t\phi\big(x\gamma_s^r(\mathbf{1})\alpha_s(\dot{a}_r)\alpha_s(\gamma_{t-s}^r(\mathbf{1}))\big)\,\mathrm{d}\, s \\
&= \int_0^t\phi\big(x\gamma_s^r(\mathbf{1})\alpha_s(\dot{a}_r)\gamma_s^r(\mathbf{1})^*\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})\big)\,\mathrm{d}\, s \\
&= \int_0^t\phi\big(x\alpha_s^r(\delta_r(Q))\big)\,\mathrm{d}\, s\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1}),
\end{aligned}$$

using

$$\alpha_s(\gamma_{t-s}^r(\mathbf{1})) = \alpha_s(\gamma_{-s}^r\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})) = \alpha_s(\gamma_{-s}^r\alpha_{-s}(\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1}))) = \gamma_s^r(\mathbf{1})^*\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1}))$$

and $\alpha_t^r(y) = \gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})y\gamma_t^r(\mathbf{1})$ in the last two steps.

Consider now, for given $x_0,..,x_n \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^\infty)_c^\gamma$, the functions

$$r\in[0,1]\mapsto K_{x_0,..,x_n}(r;t_1,...,t_n,u) = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\, r}\phi(x_0\alpha_{t_1}^r(\delta_r(x_1))\cdots\alpha_{tn}^r(\delta_r(x_n))\gamma_u^r(\mathbf{1})),\quad t_i,u\in\mathbb{R}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&K_{x_0,..,x_n}(r;t_1,...,t_n,u) \\
&\quad = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\phi(x_0\alpha_{t_1}^r(\delta_r(x_1))...\alpha_{t_j}^r([Q,x_j])\cdots\alpha_{tn}^r(\delta_r(x_n))\gamma_u^r(\mathbf{1})) \\
&\qquad + \sum_{j=1}^{n}\int_0^{t_j}\phi(x_0\alpha_{t_1}^r(\delta_r(x_1))\cdots[\alpha_s^r(\delta_r(Q)),\alpha_{t_j}^r(\delta_r(x_j))]\cdots\alpha_{t_n}^r(\delta_r(x_n))\gamma_u^r(\mathbf{1}))\,\mathrm{d}\, s \\
&\qquad + \int_0^1\phi(x_0\alpha_{t_1}^r(\delta_r(x_1))\cdots\alpha_{tn}^r(\delta_r(x_n))\alpha_s(\delta_r(Q))\gamma_u^r(\mathbf{1}))\,\mathrm{d}\, s \\
&\quad = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\phi(x_0\alpha_{t_1}^r(\delta_r(x_1))\cdots\alpha_{t_j}^r([Q,x_j])\cdots\alpha_{tn}^r(\delta_r(x_n))\gamma_u^r(\mathbf{1})) \\
&\qquad + \sum_{j=0}^{n}\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}}\phi(x_0\alpha_{t_1}^r(\delta_r(x_1))\cdots\alpha_{t_j}^r(\delta_r(x_j))\alpha_s^r(\delta_r(Q))\cdots\alpha_{tn}^r(\delta_r(x_n))\gamma_u^r(\mathbf{1}))\,\mathrm{d}\, s,
\end{aligned}$$

where $t_0 = 0$ and $t_{n+1} = 1$. The first term and the integrand of the second term on the RHS can be analytically continued in every variable, and hence $K_{x_0,...,n_n}(r;\cdot)$ can be extended to the tube $\mathcal{T}^{n=1}$, in the same way as F_n^r. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,r}\tau_n^r(x_0,...,x_n) =&\sum_{k=1}^{n} F_n^r(x_0,\delta_r(x_1),...,[Q,x_k],...,\delta_r(x_n))\\ &+\sum_{k=0}^{n} F_{n+1}^r(x_0,\delta_r(x_1),...,\delta_r(x_k),\delta_r(Q),...,\delta_r(x_n))\\ =&(BG_{n+1}^r + bG_{n-1}^r)(x_0,...,x_n) = (\partial G^r)_n(x_0,...,x_n).\end{aligned}$$

□

As a corollary of the proof we find

$$\phi^r(\mathbf{1}) = \tau_0^r(\mathbf{1}) = \tau_0(\mathbf{1}) + \int_0^r (\partial G^q)_0(\mathbf{1})\,\mathrm{d}\,q = \tau_0(\mathbf{1}) + 0 = \phi(\mathbf{1}) = 1, \tag{C.20}$$

which completes the proof of property (S_3) in Proposition 4.5.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Paolo Camassa, Sebastiano Carpi, and Roberto Longo for several helpful and pleasant discussions, for comments and for pointing out problems. Moreover, I thank the anonymous referee for critics and improvements.

References

[Ara70] H. Araki. On quasi-free states of CAR and Bogoliubov automorphisms. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* 6, 385-442, 1970.

[AM71] H. Araki and S. Masafumi. On quasi-free states of the canonical commutation relations. I. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* 7, 105–120, 1971.

[Ara71] H. Araki. On quasi-free states of the canonical commutation relations. II. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* 7, 121–152, 1971.

[BL90] S. Bell and L. Lempert. A C^∞ Schwarz reflection principle in one and several complex variables *J. Diff. Geom.* 32, 899–915, 1990.

[BR97] O. Bratteli and D. Robinson. *Operator algebras and quantum statistical mechanics.* Springer, 1997.

[BG07] D. Buchholz and H. Grundling. Algebraic supersymmetry: a case study. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 272, 699–750, 2007.

[BJ89] D. Buchholz and P. Junglas. On the existence of equilibrium states in local quantum field theory. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 121, 255–270, 1989.

[BL00] D. Buchholz and R. Longo. Graded KMS functionals and the breakdown of supersymmetry. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 3, 615–626, 2000. Addendum: *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 6, 1909–1910, 2000.

[BMT88] D. Buchholz, G. Mack, and I. Todorov. The current algebra on the circle as a germ of local field theories. *Nucl. Phys. B-Proc. Suppl.* 5, 20–56, 1988.

[BSM90] D. Buchholz and H. Schulz-Mirbach. Haag duality in conformal quantum field theory. *Rev. Math. Phys* 2, 105–125, 1990.

[Böc96] J. Böckenhauer. Localized endomorphisms of the chiral Ising model. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 177, 265–304, 1996.

[Car04] S. Carpi. On the representation theory of Virasoro nets. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 244, 261–284, 2004.

[CCHW12] S. Carpi, R. Conti, R. Hillier, and M. Weiner. Representations of conformal nets, universal C*-algebras and K-theory. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, DOI:10.1007/s00220-012-1561-5 *arXiv:* 1202.2543, 2012

[CHL12] S. Carpi, R. Hillier, and R. Longo. Superconformal nets and noncommutative geometry. *in preparation*, 2012.

[CHKL10] S. Carpi, R. Hillier, Y. Kawahigashi, and R. Longo. Spectral triples and the super-Virasoro algebra. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 295, 71–97, 2010.

[CKL08] S. Carpi, Y. Kawahigashi, and R. Longo. Structure and classification of superconformal nets. *Ann. Henri Poincare* 9, 1069–1121, 2008.

[CLTW11a] P. Camassa, R. Longo, Y. Tanimoto, and M. Weiner. Thermal states in conformal QFT. I. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 309, 703–735, 2011.

[CLTW11b] P. Camassa, R. Longo, Y. Tanimoto, and M. Weiner. Thermal states in conformal QFT. II. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 315, 771–802, 2012.

[Con89] A. Connes. Entire cyclic cohomology of Banach algebras and characters of θ-summable Fredholm modules. *K-Theory* 1, 519–548, 1988.

[Con94] A. Connes. *Noncommutative geometry.* Academic Press, 1994.

[DF77] W. Driessler and J. Fröhlich. The reconstruction of local observable algebras from the Euclidean Green's functions of relativistic quantum field theory. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare* 27 (1977), 221-236.

[FG93] J. Fröhlich and F. Gabbiani. Operator algebras and conformal field theory. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 155, 569–640, 1993.

[Fuc84] J. Fuchs. Thermal and superthermal properties of supersymmetric field theories, *Nucl. Phys. B*, 246, 279-301, 1984.

[GKO86] P. Goddard, A. Kent, and D. Olive. Unitary representations of the Virasoro and super-Virasoro algebras. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 103, 105–119, 1986.

[Haa92] R. Haag. *Local quantum physics.* Springer, 1992.

[JLO88] A. Jaffe, A. Lesniewski, and K. Osterwalder. Quantum K-theory. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 118, 1–14, 1988.

[JLW89] A. Jaffe, A. Lesniewski, and M. Wisniowski. Deformations of super-KMS functionals. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 121, 527–540, 1989.

[KT85] V.G. Kac and I.T. Todorov. Superconformal current algebras and their unitary representations. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 102, 337–347, 1985.

[KR86] R.V. Kadison and J.R. Ringrose. *Fundamentals of the theory of operator algebras.* Academic Press, 1986.

[Kas89] D. Kastler. Cyclic cocycles from graded KMS functionals. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 121, 345–350, 1989.

[KL05] Y. Kawahigashi and R. Longo. Noncommutative spectral invariants and black hole entropy. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 257, 193–225, 2005.

[KLM01] Y. Kawahigashi, R. Longo, and M. Müger. Multi-interval subfactors and modularity of representations in conformal field theory. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 219, 631–669, 2001.

[Lon01] R. Longo. Notes for a quantum index theorem. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 222, 45–96, 2001.

[MS59] P. Martin and J. Schwinger. Theory of many-particle systems. I. *Phys. Rev.* 115, 1342–1373, 1959.

[Mor10] H. Moriya. Supersymmetric C*-dynamical systems. *arXiv:* 1001.2622, 2010.

[Mor11] H. Moriya. On GNS representation of supersymmetric states in C*-dynamical systems. *Mathematical quantum field theory and renormalization theory. COE Lect. Note* 30, 39-47, 2011.

[PS70] R.T. Powers and E. Størmer. Free states of the canonical anticommutation relations. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 16, 1–33, 1970.

[RST69] F. Rocca, M. Sirugue, and D. Testard. On a class of equilibrium states under the Kubo-Martin-Schwinger boundary condition. Fermions. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 13, 317–334, 1969.

[RST70] F. Rocca, M. Sirugue, and D. Testard. On a class of equilibrium states under the Kubo-Martin-Schwinger boundary condition. Bosons. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 19, 119–141, 1970.

[Sto07] O. Stoytchev. Modular conjugation and the implementation of supersymmetry. *Lett. Math. Phys.* 79, 235–249, 2007.

[Wei05] M. Weiner. Conformal covariance and related properties of chiral QFT. *PhD Thesis. Università di Roma "Tor Vergata"*, arxiv:math/0703336, 2005.

[Xu05] F. Xu. Strong additivity and conformal nets. *Pac. J. Math.* 221, 167–199, 2005.